

Louis H. Feldman  
Josephus and Modern Scholarship  
(1937–1980)





Louis H. Feldman

# Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York  
1984

This volume has been issued under the general editorship of  
Wolfgang Haase, Tübingen

*CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek*

**Feldman, Louis H.:**

Josephus and modern scholarship : (1937–1980) / Louis H. Feldman. — Berlin ; New York : de Gruyter, 1984.

ISBN 3-11-008138-5

©

1984 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin 30

Alle Rechte, insbesondere das der Übersetzung in fremde Sprachen, vorbehalten. Ohne ausdrückliche Genehmigung des Verlages ist es auch nicht gestattet, dieses Buch oder Teile daraus auf photomechanischem Wege (Photokopie, Mikrokopie) zu vervielfältigen.

Printed in Germany

Satz und Druck: Arthur Collignon GmbH, Berlin

Buchbinder: Lüderitz & Bauer, Berlin

## Table of Contents

1: Introduction: General . . . . .	1
1.0: Introduction . . . . .	1
1.1: The Quantity and Languages of Josephan Scholarship . . . . .	2
2: Bibliography . . . . .	4
2.0: Bibliography of Jewish Bibliographies . . . . .	4
2.1: General Bibliography of Hebrew Books . . . . .	4
2.2: Published Catalogues of Jewish Collections . . . . .	4
2.3: Dissertations on Jewish Subjects . . . . .	6
2.4: Indices of Jewish <i>Festschriften</i> . . . . .	7
2.5: Annual Classical Bibliographies . . . . .	7
2.6: Annual Biblical Bibliographies . . . . .	8
2.7: Annual Jewish Bibliographies . . . . .	8
2.8: Collected Bibliographies of Jewish Studies Aiming at Completeness . . . . .	9
2.9: Selective Bibliographies Pertaining to Josephus through the Nineteenth Century . . . . .	9
2.10: Selective Bibliographies Pertaining to Josephus for the Twentieth Century . . . . .	9
2.11: Regularly Appearing Annotated Bibliographies of Hellenistic Judaism . . . . .	11
2.12: Brief Selective Bibliographies of Hellenistic Judaism . . . . .	12
2.13: Specialized Bibliographies in Areas Covered by or Related to Josephus: the Septuagint . . . . .	12
2.14: Specialized Bibliographies: the New Testament . . . . .	13
2.15: Specialized Bibliographies: Philo . . . . .	14
2.16: Specialized Bibliographies: the Essenes, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Slavonic Josephus (see also 22.10) . . . . .	14
2.17: Specialized Bibliographies: Bibliographies of Individual Scholars . . . . .	16
2.18: Bibliographies Devoted Specifically to Josephus . . . . .	16
3: The Text . . . . .	20
3.0: Editions of the Greek Text . . . . .	20
3.1: Transmission of the Text . . . . .	21
3.2: Studies of Individual Manuscripts and of Early Printed Editions . . . . .	24
3.3: Textual Criticism . . . . .	25
4: Translations into Modern Languages . . . . .	28
4.0: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into English . . . . .	28
4.1: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into French . . . . .	32
4.2: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into German . . . . .	33
4.3: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Hebrew . . . . .	34
4.4: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Italian . . . . .	36
4.5: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Spanish . . . . .	36
4.6: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Other Languages: Arabic, Czech, Dutch, Modern Greek, Hungarian, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serbian . . . . .	37

5: The Latin and Syriac Versions . . . . .	40
5.0: The Latin Versions: Introduction . . . . .	40
5.1: The Name Hegesippus . . . . .	40
5.2: The Text of Hegesippus . . . . .	40
5.3: Authorship of Hegesippus . . . . .	41
5.4: The Content of Hegesippus and Its Relation to Josippon . . . . .	42
5.5: The Text of the Latin Version Made under Cassiodorus' Direction . . . . .	43
5.6: Individual Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions of the Latin Version . . . . .	44
5.7: Authorship of the Latin Josephus . . . . .	45
5.8: Importance of the Latin Version . . . . .	46
5.9: The Syriac Version . . . . .	47
6: The Slavonic Version . . . . .	48
6.0: The Text of the Slavonic Version and Translations Thereof . . . . .	48
6.1: The Language of the Slavonic Version . . . . .	49
6.2: The Date, Source, Authorship, and Purpose of the Slavonic Josephus . . . . .	49
6.3: Problems of Genuineness, Omissions, and Additions of the Slavonic Version . . . . .	51
6.4: The Slavonic Version, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Essenes . . . . .	55
6.5: Translations Dependent upon the Slavonic Version . . . . .	56
7: Josippon . . . . .	57
7.0: Josippon (Josefon, Yosephon, Josephon) (the Hebrew Version of the 'Jewish War'): General . . . . .	57
7.1: The Text of Josippon . . . . .	58
7.2: Translations of Josippon . . . . .	61
7.3: Authorship and Authenticity of Josippon . . . . .	62
7.4: The Date and Place of Composition of Josippon . . . . .	62
7.5: The Sources of Josippon . . . . .	66
7.6: The Content and Outlook of Josippon . . . . .	71
7.7: The Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon . . . . .	73
8: Josephus' Life . . . . .	75
8.0: Josephus' Life: General . . . . .	75
8.1: Sources for Josephus' Life . . . . .	76
8.2: Josephus' Family, Education, and Early Life . . . . .	79
8.3: Josephus' Appointment as Military General in Galilee . . . . .	84
8.4: Josephus' Conduct as Military General in Galilee . . . . .	87
8.5: Josephus' Surrender at Jotapata . . . . .	88
8.6: Josephus' Prophecy to Vespasian . . . . .	93
8.7: Josephus and Justus of Tiberias . . . . .	96
9: General Accounts of Josephus . . . . .	99
9.0: Older Books and Articles on Josephus in General . . . . .	99
9.1: Book-length Studies (1937–1980) Dealing with Josephus in General . . . . .	104
9.2: Shorter General Accounts of Josephus' Life and Works in Encyclopedias . . . . .	107
9.3: Shorter General Accounts of Josephus' Life and Works in Books Other than Ency- clopedias . . . . .	112
9.4: Josephus' Conception of Historiography in General . . . . .	117
10: Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible . . . . .	121
10.0: Josephus' Treatment of the Biblical Period: the Problem of Josephus' Modifications of the Bible Generally . . . . .	121
10.1: The Nature of Josephus' Modifications of the Bible in General . . . . .	125

10.2: Josephus' Biblical Text in General . . . . .	130
10.3: Josephus' Use of the Septuagint and of Targumim for the Hexateuch . . . . .	131
10.4: The Canon of the Bible . . . . .	134
10.5: Josephus' Version of Genesis for the pre-Abrahamic Period . . . . .	139
10.6: Josephus' Portrayal of Abraham, Melchisedek, and Isaac . . . . .	143
10.7: Joseph . . . . .	148
10.8: Moses and the Exodus . . . . .	149
10.9: Manetho, the Hyksos, and the Exodus . . . . .	157
10.10: The Sojourn of the Israelites in the Wilderness . . . . .	161
10.11: Joshua and Judges . . . . .	163
10.12: Ruth . . . . .	164
10.13: Josephus' Biblical Text for Samuel through I Maccabees . . . . .	165
10.14: Josephus on Specific Passages in Samuel and Kings . . . . .	170
10.15: Daniel . . . . .	178
10.16: The Prophetic Books . . . . .	181
10.17: Ezra and Nehemiah: General (see 11.1) . . . . .	183
10.18: Particular Passages in Ezra and Nehemiah (see 11.1) . . . . .	186
10.19: Esther . . . . .	189
 11: Josephus as Historian of the Post-Biblical Period (until 63 B.C.E.): General Issues . . . . .	192
11.0: Josephus' Treatment of the Post-Biblical Period: General . . . . .	192
11.1: Josephus' Treatment of the Persian Period . . . . .	199
11.2: Josephus' Treatment of the Hellenistic Period: General . . . . .	200
 12: Josephus as Historian of the Post-Biblical Period: Specific Events . . . . .	207
12.0: Josephus on Alexander the Great . . . . .	207
12.1: Josephus' Version of the 'Letter of Aristeas' . . . . .	208
12.2: Early Seleucid History . . . . .	210
12.3: Antiochus III . . . . .	212
12.4: The Tobiads . . . . .	215
12.5: The Relationship between the Jews and the Spartans . . . . .	217
12.6: Josephus' Version of I Maccabees . . . . .	219
12.7: Josephus' Relationship to II Maccabees . . . . .	225
12.8: Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) and the Background of the Maccabean Revolt . . . . .	226
12.9: Mattathias and Judah Maccabee . . . . .	233
12.10: Antiochus V, VI, and VII . . . . .	234
12.11: The Rulers of Egypt during the Third, Second, and First Centuries B.C.E. . . . .	236
12.12: Anti-Semitism in Ptolemaic Egypt . . . . .	237
12.13: The Hasmonean Kings Generally . . . . .	241
12.14: The Alliance of the Hasmoneans with the Romans . . . . .	245
12.15: The Kittim of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Seleucids or Romans? . . . . .	245
12.16: Jonathan the Hasmonean . . . . .	247
12.17: Simon the Hasmonean . . . . .	248
12.18: John Hyrcanus . . . . .	249
12.19: Alexander Jannaeus . . . . .	251
 13: Josephus as Historian of the Roman Period (from Pompey until Herod) . . . . .	259
13.0: The Roman Period: General . . . . .	259
13.1: Anti-Semitism during the Roman Period . . . . .	266
13.2: Josephus on Roman Institutions . . . . .	267
13.3: Roman Taxation on Jews . . . . .	267
13.4: Jews in the Roman Army . . . . .	267
13.5: Hyrcanus II and Pompey . . . . .	268

13.6: The Partition of Judaea by Gabinius . . . . .	272
13.7: The Documents in 'Antiquities', Book 14 . . . . .	273
13.8: Antigonus . . . . .	276
13.9: Antipater . . . . .	277
14: Herod . . . . .	278
14.0: Herod: General Treatments . . . . .	278
14.1: Herod: the Numismatic Evidence . . . . .	287
14.2: Herod's Appearance . . . . .	288
14.3: Herod's Title 'the Great' . . . . .	288
14.4: The Chronology of Herod's Reign . . . . .	289
14.5: Herod's Trial before the Sanhedrin . . . . .	289
14.6: Herod's Legal Position vis-à-vis Augustus and the Roman Empire . . . . .	290
14.7: Herod and Babylonian Jewry . . . . .	291
14.8: Herod as Administrator . . . . .	292
14.9: Herod's Military Colony of Batanaea . . . . .	292
14.10: The Place of Sports in Herod's Politics (see also 20.9) . . . . .	292
14.11: Herod's Building Program . . . . .	293
14.12: Herod, the Temple, and the High Priesthood . . . . .	295
14.13: Herod's Trial against His Sons . . . . .	296
14.14: Herod and Mariamne . . . . .	296
14.15: Herod and Cleopatra . . . . .	297
14.16: Herod as Messiah . . . . .	297
14.17: Herod's Death . . . . .	298
14.18: The Aftermath of Herod's Death . . . . .	299
14.19: The Herodian Family in General . . . . .	300
14.20: Phasael and Archelaus . . . . .	301
14.21: Herod Antipas and Herodias . . . . .	301
15: The Period after Herod until the Outbreak of the War against the Romans . . . . .	304
15.0: Josephus on Parthian Affairs (Antiquities 18. 39–52, etc.) . . . . .	304
15.1: The Autonomous Jewish State of Anilaeus and Asinaeus under the Parthians . . . . .	306
15.2: Josephus on Arab Affairs (cf. 25.21) . . . . .	307
15.3: The Ituraeans . . . . .	308
15.4: Josephus on Petty States in Asia Minor and Vicinity . . . . .	308
15.5: The Emperor Augustus and the Jews . . . . .	309
15.6: The Emperor Tiberius and the Jews . . . . .	309
15.7: The Roman Procurators before Pontius Pilate . . . . .	311
15.8: Pontius Pilate: General . . . . .	312
15.9: The Episode of Pilate's Introduction of the Emperor's Standards into Jerusalem . . . . .	316
15.10: Pilate: the New Inscription . . . . .	317
15.11: The Procurators after Pilate . . . . .	320
15.12: Agrippa I . . . . .	323
15.13: Gaius Caligula and Claudius . . . . .	326
15.14: The Citizenship of the Alexandrian Jews and Claudius' Edict . . . . .	331
15.15: Josephus on Philo and His Family . . . . .	338
15.16: The Status of the Jews in Syria, Especially Antioch . . . . .	338
15.17: The Jews of Asia Minor . . . . .	339
15.18: The Status of the Jews in Cyrene . . . . .	340
15.19: The Jews of Rome . . . . .	341
15.20: Agrippa II and Berenice . . . . .	341
15.21: Izates and Adiabene (see also 24.1) . . . . .	343
15.22: Nero . . . . .	345

16: The War against the Romans . . . . .	346
16.0: Josephus as a Source for the Great Jewish Revolt against the Romans (66–74 C.E.) . . . . .	346
16.1: Chronology of Events of the War . . . . .	350
16.2: The Coins as a Source for the Jewish War in General (see also 25.25) . . . . .	350
16.3: Numismatic Evidence for the Jewish War in Galilee (see also 25.25) . . . . .	351
16.4: The Causes and Goals of the War . . . . .	351
16.5: Babylonian Jewry and the War . . . . .	356
16.6: The Progress of the War . . . . .	356
16.7: The Siege of Jerusalem . . . . .	361
16.8: The Burning of the Temple . . . . .	363
16.9: The Population of Palestine and of Jerusalem in Particular in the First Century . . . . .	366
16.10: Military Aspects of the War and in Josephus in General . . . . .	370
16.11: Vespasian and Titus . . . . .	371
16.12: The Arch of Titus . . . . .	375
16.13: Domitian . . . . .	377
17: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works . . . . .	378
17.0: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: the 'War' . . . . .	378
17.1: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: the 'Life' . . . . .	380
17.2: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: 'Against Apion' . . . . .	384
17.3: Proposed Works . . . . .	387
17.4: Doubtful and Spurious Works . . . . .	389
17.5: Falsifications in Josephus . . . . .	391
18: Josephus' Sources . . . . .	392
18.0: Josephus' Sources: General . . . . .	392
18.1: Herodotus and Thucydides . . . . .	394
18.2: Other Classical Greek Writers of the Fifth Century B.C.E. . . . .	394
18.3: Menander . . . . .	394
18.4: Clearchus of Soli and Hermippus of Smyrna . . . . .	395
18.5: Hecataeus and Pseudo-Hecataeus . . . . .	396
18.6: Berossus . . . . .	400
18.7: Demetrius of Phalerum . . . . .	400
18.8: Aristobulus . . . . .	400
18.9: Alexander Polyhistor . . . . .	401
18.10: Eupolemus . . . . .	401
18.11: Artapanus . . . . .	402
18.12: Nicolaus of Damascus . . . . .	402
18.13: Strabo . . . . .	406
18.14: Dionysius of Halicarnassus . . . . .	407
18.15: 'Longinus' . . . . .	408
18.16: The Testament (Assumption) of Moses . . . . .	409
18.17: Philo (see also 2.15) . . . . .	410
18.18: Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' . . . . .	418
18.19: Sallust . . . . .	419
19: Josephus' Views on the Jewish Religion . . . . .	420
19.0: Josephus' Outlook on Judaism: General . . . . .	420
19.1: G-d . . . . .	423
19.2: The Decalogue . . . . .	428
19.3: Demons . . . . .	429
19.4: Magic . . . . .	429
19.5: Dreams . . . . .	430

19.6: The Soul . . . . .	430
19.7: Fate and Free Will . . . . .	431
19.8: Suffering . . . . .	434
19.9: Prayer . . . . .	435
19.10: The Synagogue . . . . .	436
19.11: Baptism . . . . .	437
19.12: The Priests Generally . . . . .	437
19.13: The Description of the Temple . . . . .	438
19.14: The Warning Inscription of the Temple . . . . .	444
19.15: The Half-Shekel Tax of the Temple and Other Donations . . . . .	447
19.16: Excavations of the Temple Area (see also 25.12) . . . . .	447
19.17: The High Priesthood . . . . .	448
19.18: The Clothing and Stones of the High Priest . . . . .	457
19.19: The Effects of the Destruction of the Temple . . . . .	458
19.20: The Temple at Leontopolis . . . . .	459
19.21: The Sanhedrin . . . . .	463
19.22: Rabbinic Sages: Onias (Honi) and Pollio (Abtalion) . . . . .	467
19.23: Prophecy . . . . .	469
19.24: False Prophets . . . . .	476
19.25: Miracles . . . . .	477
19.26: Josephus' Philosophy of History . . . . .	480
19.27: Josephus' Political Theory . . . . .	481
19.28: The Chosen People . . . . .	482
19.29: Josephus' Philosophy of Education . . . . .	482
19.30: Josephus' Attitude toward the Land of Israel . . . . .	482
19.31: Resurrection . . . . .	483
19.32: The Messiah and Eschatology in General . . . . .	484
19.33: The Messianic Background of the Jewish Revolt . . . . .	489
19.34: Josephus' Attitude toward Women . . . . .	491
 20: Josephus' Views on Halakhah (Jewish Law) . . . . .	 492
20.0: Josephus' Attitude toward Halakhah (Jewish Law): General . . . . .	492
20.1: Courts, Witnesses, and Punishments . . . . .	498
20.2: Religious Law: the Priesthood and Other Laws of Ritual . . . . .	500
20.3: The Calendar . . . . .	502
20.4: The Sabbath . . . . .	503
20.5: Sabbatical Years and Jubilees . . . . .	506
20.6: Festivals . . . . .	507
20.7: Sacrifices and Ritual Banquets . . . . .	511
20.8: Idolatry . . . . .	512
20.9: Athletics (see also 14.10) . . . . .	515
20.10: Attitude toward Foreign Cults . . . . .	516
20.11: Attitude toward Other Philosophies . . . . .	519
20.12: Law of Persons: Slavery, Charity, Marriage, Abortion, Divorce . . . . .	519
20.13: Theft, Kidnapping, Agency . . . . .	522
20.14: Suicide . . . . .	524
20.15: Treatment of Animals . . . . .	526
 21: Religious Movements: the Samaritans . . . . .	 528
21.0: Religious Movements: the Samaritans: Josephus as a Source . . . . .	528
21.1: The Origin of the Samaritans . . . . .	533
21.2: The Building of the Samaritan Temple . . . . .	537
21.3: Events in the History of the Samaritans . . . . .	539



22: The Pharisees and Divergent Jewish Sects . . . . .	542
22.0: The Jewish Sects: General . . . . .	542
22.1: The Views of the Sects: Fate and Prophecy . . . . .	549
22.2: The Pharisees: General . . . . .	551
22.3: The Pharisees in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities' . . . . .	560
22.4: The Name, Definition, and Origin of the Pharisees . . . . .	562
22.5: The Beliefs and Practices of the Pharisees . . . . .	566
22.6: The History of the Pharisees: Opposition to Hellenism, to the Hasmonean Kings, and to the Great War against Rome . . . . .	569
22.7: The Relationship of the Pharisees to Apocalyptic Groups and to the Dead Sea Sect . . . . .	572
22.8: The Influence of the Pharisees (see also 22.3) . . . . .	574
22.9: The Sadducees . . . . .	579
22.10: The Essenes in Josephus: Bibliography (see also 2.16) . . . . .	580
22.11: The Texts Pertaining to the Essenes in Josephus . . . . .	580
22.12: Josephus' Account of the Essenes: General . . . . .	582
22.13: The Authenticity of Josephus' Account of the Essenes . . . . .	586
22.14: Comparison of the Accounts of the Essenes in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities' . . . . .	587
22.15: The Etymology of the Name Essenes . . . . .	588
22.16: The Origin of the Essenes . . . . .	590
22.17: Josephus' Relationship to Other Sources for the Essenes: Philo, the 'Sibylline Oracles', Hippolytus (see also 27.11) . . . . .	592
22.18: Beliefs and Practices of the Essenes: General . . . . .	594
22.19: The Attitude of the Essenes toward the Temple and Sacrifices . . . . .	597
22.20: Ritual and Practices of the Essenes: Initiation, Baths, Purity, Asceticism, Prayer, Work . . . . .	600
22.21: The Meals of the Essenes . . . . .	605
22.22: The Oaths of the Essenes . . . . .	607
22.23: The Pacifism of the Essenes . . . . .	609
22.24: The History of the Essenes . . . . .	610
22.25: The Relationship of the Essenes to Other Movements: the Herodians . . . . .	612
22.26: The Essenes and Hermeticism, Gnosticism, the Therapeutae, and the Essenes of Ephesus . . . . .	614
22.27: The Essenes and the Dacians . . . . .	616
22.28: The Essenes and the Magi . . . . .	617
22.29: The Relationship of the Essenes to the Dead Sea Sect . . . . .	618
22.30: The Relationship of the Essenes to the Christians . . . . .	633
22.31: The Zealots: General . . . . .	637
22.32: The Name and Origin of the Zealots . . . . .	642
22.33: The Relationship of the Maccabees to the Zealots . . . . .	646
22.34: The Views of the Zealots . . . . .	647
22.35: The Relationship of the Zealots to the Essenes and to the Dead Sea Sect . . . . .	648
22.36: The Relationship of the Zealots to Jesus and to Early Christianity . . . . .	651
22.37: The Sicarii, the Fourth Philosophy, and the Zealots . . . . .	655
22.38: The Galilaeans' . . . . .	667
22.39: The ἡριστοί . . . . .	670
22.40: Individual Revolutionary Leaders: Judas of Galilee, John of Gischala, Simon bar Giora, Menahem . . . . .	670
23: Christianity . . . . .	673
23.0: Josephus on John the Baptist . . . . .	673
23.1: The 'Testimonium Flavianum' on Jesus: Bibliography . . . . .	679
23.2: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': General . . . . .	680
23.3: Josephus' Sources for the 'Testimonium Flavianum' . . . . .	691

23.4: Josephus' Motives for Inserting the 'Testimonium' . . . . .	691
23.5: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': "He Was the Messiah" . . . . .	693
23.6: The 'Testimonium Flavianum', Origen, and Eusebius . . . . .	695
23.7: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': the Context . . . . .	696
23.8: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': Its Language . . . . .	697
23.9: Jesus' Appearance according to the Original 'Testimonium' . . . . .	699
23.10: The Arabic and Syriac Versions of the 'Testimonium Flavianum' . . . . .	700
23.11: Jesus Son of Ananias . . . . .	703
23.12: Josephus on James . . . . .	704
23.13: Josephus' Relationship to the New Testament: General . . . . .	707
23.14: The Census of Quirinius in Josephus and in Luke . . . . .	709
23.15: Theudas in Josephus and in Acts . . . . .	717
23.16: Other Parallels between Josephus and Luke-Acts . . . . .	719
23.17: Parallels between Josephus and Other Books of the New Testament . . . . .	723
24: Proselytes and 'Sympathizers' . . . . .	726
24.0: Proselytes in Josephus: General . . . . .	726
24.1: The Conversion of King Izates of Adiabene to Judaism (see also 15.21) . . . . .	730
24.2: Jewish 'Sympathizers' in Josephus . . . . .	732
25: Josephus and Archaeology . . . . .	735
25.0: Josephus and the Geography, Topography, and Archaeology of the Land of Israel: General . . . . .	735
25.1: Josephus and Archaeology: Asophon . . . . .	740
25.2: Caesarea . . . . .	740
25.3: Callirrhoe . . . . .	744
25.4: Caphareccho . . . . .	744
25.5: Gaba . . . . .	745
25.6: Gerasa . . . . .	745
25.7: Herodium . . . . .	746
25.8: Jericho . . . . .	747
25.9: Jerusalem: General . . . . .	748
25.10: The Walls of Jerusalem . . . . .	753
25.11: The Antonia in Jerusalem . . . . .	757
25.12: Other Sites in Jerusalem (see also 19.16) . . . . .	758
25.13: Machaerus . . . . .	761
25.14: Masada before YADIN's Excavations of 1963–65 . . . . .	763
25.15: YADIN's Excavations of Masada . . . . .	765
25.16: The Talmud's Silence about Masada . . . . .	769
25.17: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: General . . . . .	772
25.18: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: the Speeches of Eleazar ben Jair . . . . .	777
25.19: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: the Suicide . . . . .	779
25.20: The Date of the Capture of Masada . . . . .	789
25.21: Josephus and Archaeology: the Nabataeans . . . . .	790
25.22: Tiberias . . . . .	791
25.23: Other Sites in Israel and Transjordan: Akbara (Acchabaron), Alexandrion, Amathous, 'Arâq el-Emîr, Azekus (Azeka), Ascalon, Baniyas, Besara, Emmaus, Gader, Gamla (Gamala), Geba (Gibeah), Gilgal, Golan, Hyrcania, Jotapata, Machpelah, Mambre, Meiron, Petra, Ptolemais (Akko), Salem, Samaria, Sennabris, Sepphoris, Mount Sinai, Valley of the Cilicians . . . . .	792
25.24: Sites in Lebanon and in Syria . . . . .	798
25.25: Josephus and Numismatic Evidence (see also 16.2 and 16.3) . . . . .	799

26: Vocabulary and Style . . . . .	803
26.0: Dictionaries and Concordances to Josephus . . . . .	803
26.1: Josephus' Vocabulary: Individual Words . . . . .	806
26.2: Proper Names in Josephus . . . . .	815
26.3: Josephus' Statements about His Knowledge of Greek . . . . .	817
26.4: Josephus' Language and Style . . . . .	819
26.5: Speeches and Letters in Josephus . . . . .	822
26.6: Dramatic Elements in Josephus . . . . .	825
26.7: Symbolism, Allegory, and Metaphor in Josephus . . . . .	826
26.8: References to Poetry and to Music . . . . .	826
26.9: Josephus' Literary Assistants . . . . .	827
26.10: Josephus' Grammar . . . . .	830
26.11: Hebrew as Josephus' Ancestral Language . . . . .	831
26.12: Aramaisms in the 'War' . . . . .	832
26.13: Aramaic Sources for the 'Antiquities' . . . . .	834
26.14: Josephus' Knowledge of Latin (see also 26.4) . . . . .	836
26.15: The Alleged Second Edition of the 'Antiquities' . . . . .	837
 27: Josephus' Influence until the Twentieth Century . . . . .	 839
27.0: Josephus' Influence: General . . . . .	839
27.1: Parallels between Josephus and the Talmud . . . . .	840
27.2: Josephus and Tacitus . . . . .	840
27.3: Parallels between Josephus and Suetonius . . . . .	843
27.4: Parallels between Josephus and Lucian . . . . .	843
27.5: Parallels between Josephus and Apuleius . . . . .	843
27.6: Parallels between Josephus and Dio Cassius . . . . .	843
27.7: Josephus' Influence on Porphyry . . . . .	844
27.8: Libanius . . . . .	845
27.9: The Church Fathers in General . . . . .	845
27.10: The Greek Hegesippus . . . . .	846
27.11: Hippolytus (see also 22.17) . . . . .	846
27.12: Origen . . . . .	847
27.13: Theophilus, Eusebius, John Chrysostom, and Pseudo-Kaisarios . . . . .	848
27.14: Minucius Felix and Tertullian . . . . .	849
27.15: Jerome . . . . .	850
27.16: Augustine . . . . .	851
27.17: Cassiodorus . . . . .	851
27.18: Coptic Literature . . . . .	851
27.19: Armenian Literature . . . . .	852
27.20: Syriac Literature . . . . .	852
27.21: Josephus' Influence during the Middle Ages Generally . . . . .	853
27.22: The Alexander Legend . . . . .	854
27.23: Particular Medieval Latin Authors in Western Europe: Bede, Rabanus Maurus, Richard of St. Victor, Peter Comestor, Fulcher of Chartres . . . . .	855
27.24: Medieval Greek Authors in Eastern Europe: George Hamartolos, Anonymus 'De obsidione toleranda', Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, 'Palaea Historica' . . . . .	856
27.25: The Medieval Legend of Josephus the Physician . . . . .	858
27.26: Josephus' Influence on Renaissance Figures (Nicolas de Lyre, Isaac Abrabanel) and in the Reformation and post-Reformation Periods . . . . .	859
27.27: English Literature: General . . . . .	861
27.28: The Herod Theme in English Literature . . . . .	863
27.29: French Literature . . . . .	863
27.30: Italian Literature . . . . .	864

27.31: Spanish Literature . . . . .	865
27.32: The Miscellaneous Influence of Josephus: the 'Josephus Problem' in Mathematics . . . . .	868
27.33: Censorship of Josephus . . . . .	869
27.34: The Influence of Josephus on Art and Music . . . . .	869
27.35: The Influence of the Slavonic Version of the 'War' . . . . .	871
27.36: The Influence of Josippon . . . . .	872
27.37: The Influence of the Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon . . . . .	874
28: Josephus' Influence on Modern Contemporary Literature . . . . .	876
28.0: The Influence of Josephus on Modern Fiction: General . . . . .	876
28.1: Modern Fiction: FEUCHTWANGER . . . . .	876
28.2: Contemporary Novels about Herod . . . . .	878
28.3: Contemporary Novels about Masada . . . . .	878
28.4: Other Modern Fiction . . . . .	879
28.5: Contemporary Drama about Herod . . . . .	880
28.6: Contemporary Poetry and Drama about Masada . . . . .	880
28.7: Other Modern Drama . . . . .	881
28.8: Films . . . . .	882
28.9: Contemporary Politics: the Masada Complex . . . . .	882
29: Desiderata . . . . .	884
29.0: Summary and Desiderata in the Study of Josephus: Bibliography . . . . .	884
29.1: Desiderata: the Tools for Scholarship in the Field of Hellenistic-Roman Jewish History . . . . .	885
29.2: Desiderata: the Text . . . . .	886
29.3: Desiderata: the Latin, Slavonic, and Rumanian Versions; Josippon and the Arabic Version of Josippon . . . . .	887
29.4: Desiderata: Accounts of Josephus as an Historian . . . . .	888
29.5: Desiderata: Josephus and the Bible . . . . .	890
29.6: Desiderata: Spurious Works . . . . .	891
29.7: Desiderata: Josephus and Halakhah . . . . .	891
29.8: Desiderata: Josephus' Language, Style, and Literary Techniques . . . . .	892
29.9: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Ancient, Medieval, and Renaissance Literature . . . . .	892
29.10: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Modern Literature . . . . .	894
29.11: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Modern Historiography . . . . .	895
29.12: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Art and Music . . . . .	896
29.13: Desiderata: the Influence of the Slavonic Version of Josippon, and of the Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon . . . . .	896
Addenda . . . . .	899
Indices . . . . .	977
I. Index of References . . . . .	977
A. Josephus . . . . .	977
1. 'War' . . . . .	977
2. 'Antiquities' . . . . .	984
3. 'Life' . . . . .	996
4. 'Against Apion' . . . . .	997
B. Ancient and Medieval Versions of Josephus . . . . .	999
1. Hegesippus . . . . .	999
2. The Latin Translation Ascribed to Cassiodorus . . . . .	999

3. The Slavonic Version of the 'War' . . . . .	999
4. Josippon . . . . .	999
5. The Syriac Version of Book 6 of the 'War' . . . . .	999
C. Hebrew Scriptures and Septuagint . . . . .	999
D. Other Versions in Greek, Latin, and Syriac of the Hebrew Scriptures . . . . .	1002
E. Apocrypha . . . . .	1002
F. Pseudepigrapha . . . . .	1003
G. Dead Sea Scrolls . . . . .	1004
H. Samaritan Writings . . . . .	1004
I. New Testament . . . . .	1005
J. Greco-Jewish and Greco-Samaritan Writers (except Philo and Josephus) . . . . .	1006
K. Philo and Pseudo-Philo . . . . .	1007
L. Rabbinic Writings . . . . .	1008
1. Mishnah . . . . .	1008
2. Tosefta . . . . .	1009
3. Babylonian Talmud . . . . .	1009
4. Jerusalem Talmud . . . . .	1010
5. Midrashim . . . . .	1011
6. Targumim . . . . .	1011
7. Other Rabbinic Works . . . . .	1011
M. Pagan Greek Writers . . . . .	1012
N. Pagan Latin Writers . . . . .	1014
O. Tablets, Inscriptions, Papyri, Prosopography, Manuscripts, and Laws . . . . .	1016
P. Early Christian Writers in Greek . . . . .	1016
Q. Early Christian Writers in Latin . . . . .	1018
R. Medieval Writers in Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Russian, and Syriac . . . . .	1018
S. Post-Talmudic Hebrew Writers until the Eighteenth Century . . . . .	1019
T. Byzantine Greek Writers . . . . .	1019
U. Medieval Latin Writers . . . . .	1020
V. Modern Literary Figures . . . . .	1020
II. Index of Words . . . . .	1022
A. Greek . . . . .	1022
B. Latin . . . . .	1028
C. Hebrew and Aramaic . . . . .	1029
D. Other Languages: Arabic, Egyptian, Hyksos, Parthian (Persian), Phoenician, Rumanian, Sumerian, Syriac, Thracian, Indo-European . . . . .	1030
III. Index of Names of Modern Writers . . . . .	1030



# 1: Introduction: General

## 1.0: Introduction

The present critical bibliography not only updates the portion of my 'Scholarship on Philo and Josephus' (1937–1962) (Yeshiva University, Studies in Judaica, 1; New York 1963) dealing with Josephus, but it includes numerous items omitted from that survey, as well as revisions of many comments made there.

The system of classification has been changed so as to include many more subdivisions. Each subdivision begins with a list of items, generally arranged chronologically, though modified by considerations of subject-matter, covered in that entry. Items appearing in more than one subdivision are repeated in the bibliographical entries at the beginning of every section where they appear. Some items are included in a subdivision not because of their central relevance to that subdivision but because in the course of the discussion which follows the author has had occasion to mention them. A number of items published before 1937 have been included because of their relevance to the critical discussion, though no attempt has been made to be systematic or comprehensive for this earlier work.

The present survey differs from HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG's 'Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus' (Leiden 1968; supplement 1979) in two major respects: 1) It presents summaries and criticisms of the various items, whereas in general, SCHRECKENBERG merely lists the items and indicates the pages relevant to Josephus; 2) It is arranged according to topics and sub-topics, so that the reader may be able to see the state of the question for various aspects of Josephan scholarship, whereas SCHRECKENBERG's original bibliography is arranged by year of publication and his supplement alphabetically, without indication of the connection of the bibliographical items.

This work was completed and submitted to the editor in October, 1975, but delays were encountered in getting it into print. When this was finally assured in 1980, a supplement was clearly necessary to bring it up to date. The additional items have been included in the appropriate places and, to the extent possible, integrated with the original text.

The survey aims at completeness from 1937 through 1980, with a few items included beyond that date. The author will be grateful for information as to omissions or errors, as well as for suggestions for making it more useful.

The author wishes to acknowledge, with sincere gratitude, assistance received from the Louis and Minna Epstein Fund of the American Academy for

Jewish Research, from the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation, from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, from the American Council of Learned Societies, and from the American Philosophical Society in the pursuit of this research. He desires to thank Dr. WOLFGANG HAASE for reading the entire work and Dr. SHAYE J. COHEN and Mr. BARUCH HILL for reading portions of the manuscript and for giving many helpful suggestions.

This work is dedicated to my wife MIRIAM, who ceaselessly transmits with all her heart the sacred tradition of her martyred parents to our beloved children, Moshe, Sara, and Leah.

### 1.1: The Quantity and Languages of Josephan Scholarship

(1) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus* (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums, 1). Leiden 1968.

(1a) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *A Supplement to Heinz Schreckenberg's Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus*. In progress.

It may be of interest to note the changes in the quantity and languages of Josephan scholarship during the present century. For the period 1909–1913 the items listed in SCHRECKENBERG (1) are in the following languages: German – 64; English – 11; French – 10; Latin – 5; Italian – 3; Arabic – 1; Dutch – 1; Modern Greek – 1. My own supplement (1a) to SCHRECKENBERG adds the following: German – 14; English – 13; French – 8; Latin – 1; Italian – 1; Hebrew – 4; Czech – 3; Spanish – 1. We thus have the following totals and percentages: German – 78 (55%); English – 24 (17%); French – 18 (13%); Latin – 6 (4%); Italian – 4 (3%); Hebrew – 4 (3%); Czech – 3 (2%); Arabic – 1 (1%); Dutch – 1 (1%); Modern Greek – 1 (1%); Spanish – 1 (1%). The total number of items for the five-year period is 141.

For the period 1961–1965 (the last five-year period for which SCHRECKENBERG attempts to be complete) SCHRECKENBERG lists items in the following languages: German – 47; English – 83; French – 17; Italian – 5; Hebrew – 7; Czech – 1; Spanish – 3; Hungarian – 3; Polish – 2; Danish – 1; Portuguese – 1. My own addenda, included in my forthcoming supplement (1a), are in the following languages: German – 24; English – 87; French – 20; Latin – 1; Italian – 11; Hebrew – 12; Spanish – 5; Hungarian – 3; Polish – 5; Modern Greek – 1; Russian – 3; Serbian – 2; Swedish – 2; Bulgarian – 1; Flemish – 1. The totals and percentages are as follows: German – 71 (20%); English – 170 (49%); French – 37 (11%); Italian – 16 (5%); Hebrew – 19 (5%); Spanish – 8 (2%); Hungarian – 6 (2%); Polish – 7 (2%); Russian – 3 (1%); Serbian – 2 (1%); Swedish – 2 (1%); Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Flemish, Modern Greek, Latin, Portuguese – 1 each (less than 1% each). The total number of items for the five-year period is 348.

One is struck by the sheer increase – 147% – in the amount of published material and by the relative increase in the amount in English (most of it in the United States, where many universities have a ‘publish or perish’ philosophy) and the relative decrease in German, and to a lesser degree by the increase in the



amount of work in Hebrew and Italian. As one who has read almost all of this material, the present writer is reminded of the anecdote which Cicero (*Pro Archia* 10.25) tells about Sulla, who rewarded a worthless poet who had composed an epigram about him with a present of property from proscribed persons, on the condition that he should not write anything thereafter. In addition to the *Desiderata* listed at the end of this study, we may be forgiven for expressing the hope – or prayer – that one of the wealthier foundations will establish a fund to give grants on similar conditions, or, at the very least, on the condition that scholars will read what has been written in their field before they embark with pen in hand.

## 2: Bibliography

### 2.0: Bibliography of Jewish Bibliographies

- (2) SHLOMO SHUNAMI: *Bibliography of Jewish Bibliographies*. Jerusalem 1936; 2nd (thoroughly revised) ed., 1965; rpt. (with supplements) 1969.
- (2a) JOHN C. HURD, JR.: *A Bibliography of New Testament Bibliographies*. New York 1966.

SHUNAMI's (2) revision of his standard work, containing 4727 entries, carefully subdivided as to subject-matter and with extensive indices of names, subjects, and Hebrew titles, is truly a blessing for the field of Jewish scholarship; but for Josephus we are given references to some bibliographies in books that are far less complete than some that are omitted, so that the selection seems, in some cases, almost capricious.

HURD (2a) covers the New Testament field only; but he is very incomplete for intertestamental Judaism, Philo, and Josephus (pp. 40–41).

### 2.1: General Bibliography of Hebrew Books

- (3) BERNHARD (CHAIM D.) FRIEDBERG: *Bet Eked Sefarim*. 4 vols. Tel-Aviv 1951–56.

For items printed in Hebrew, and, to some degree, in Yiddish, as well as in other languages printed in Hebrew characters during the years 1474–1950, FRIEDBERG (3) is the most complete, though not always reliable, listing to date. The work is particularly useful for listings of editions of Josippon.

### 2.2: Published Catalogues of Jewish Collections

- (4) New York Public Library: *Dictionary Catalog of the Jewish Collection*. 14 vols. Boston 1960.
- (5) Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion: *Dictionary Catalog of the Klau Library*, Cincinnati. 32 vols. Boston 1964.
- (6) CHARLES BERLIN, ed.: *Harvard University Library, Catalogue of Hebrew Books*. 6 vols. Cambridge, Mass. 1968. 3 supplementary vols., Cambridge, Mass. 1972.
- (7) United States Library of Congress: *Hebraic Title Catalogue* (unpublished card catalogue).
- (8) University of Chicago Oriental Institute: *Catalog of the Oriental Institute Library*, University of Chicago. 16 vols. Boston 1970.
- (9) Union Theological Seminary Library: *Alphabetical Arrangement of Main Entries from the Shelf List*. 10 vols. Boston 1960.

- (10) ARON FREIMANN, ed.: *Katalog der Judaica und Hebraica Stadtbibliothek Frankfurt am Main*. Frankfurt 1932; rpt. 1968.
- (11) *Livraria Ets Haim*: [Catalogue.] 7 vols. for books in Hebrew, 2 vols. for books in other languages. Amsterdam 1966.
- (12) LEVIE HIRSCHL and M. S. HILLESUM: *Systematische Catalogus van de Judaica der Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana*. 9 fascicles. Amsterdam 1965–66. Supplement 1, Amsterdam 1971.
- (12a) RAYMOND J. TOURNAY, director: *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de l'École Biblique et Archéologique Française* (Catalog of the Library of the French Biblical and Archeological School), Jerusalem, Israel. 13 vols. Boston 1975.
- (12b) ALEXANDER MARX: *Bibliographical Studies and Notes on Rare Books and Manuscripts in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, ed. MENAHEM H. SCHMELZER. New York 1977.

Of great value are the published catalogues of two of the major collections of Judaica in the world, namely, those of the New York Public Library (4) and of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (5). The former, listing more items (about 270,000) than any other published catalogue of Jewish books, is particularly useful since it has separate entries for many articles in periodicals. The latter comprises about 200,000 entries.

BERLIN's (6) Harvard University Catalogue is restricted to about 40,000 books, all in Hebrew, and hence is of particular value for editions of Josippon, the Hebrew paraphrase of the 'Jewish War', but not for the subject of Josephus in general. The same may be said for the unpublished United States Library of Congress (7) Hebraic Title Catalogue, which reflects about 75% of the Library's holdings of 104,000 Hebrew and Yiddish volumes.

Also useful, though not devoted specifically to Judaica, are the published catalogues of the University of Chicago Oriental Institute (8) and of the Union Theological Seminary Library (9).

Moreover, we possess published catalogues of the general collections of three of the major libraries of the world – the Bibliothèque Nationale, the British Museum, and the Library of Congress. The last is now being revised to include volumes in the major research libraries of the United States and Canada: this is the National Union Catalogue of pre-1956 Imprints (London 1968ff.), which numbers 685 volumes, plus (through 1981) 65 supplementary volumes (through Prikhodskii). The entries under 'Josephus' merely list editions and translations, however.

We still lack, however, published catalogues of two major collections of Judaica, namely, those of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Though many items in the old catalogue of the latter library are not accessible because the effects of the great fire of 1966 are still felt, the catalogue itself remains and deserves to be photographed. Bibliographical entries, however, we may note, are often less than full and frequently inaccurate.

Three smaller catalogues remain to be mentioned, that of FREIMANN (10) of the municipal library of Frankfurt, arranged alphabetically by subject and with indices, but with few entries on Josephus; that of the *Livraria Ets Haim* (11), said to be the oldest Jewish library in the world and particularly strong in

Hebrew books, which lists thirteen early editions and translations of Josephus and eleven of Josippon; and that of HIRSCHER and HILLESUM (12) of the *Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana* in Amsterdam, which, embracing about 30,000 items, is considerably larger than that of FREIMANN, but which is difficult to use pending the appearance of an index in the last installment. The items directly on Josephus, appearing in Fascicle 6, pp. 537–540, are relatively few and are not particularly unusual.

TOURNAY'S (12a) catalogue of the *École Biblique*, vol. 7, pp. 345–355, contains 216 items on Josephus, mostly references to individual articles. While it is hardly complete, it does list several articles that might otherwise not be known to the student of Josephus.

The lack of a published catalogue for the Jewish Theological Seminary has, to some degree, been remedied by the reprinting of the collection of articles by MARX (12b), librarian for many years at the Seminary and the man chiefly responsible for the assembling of its magnificent collection. His annual reports concerning the library that are here reprinted list all the more important items acquired. Fortunately the volume has an extensive index which lists a number of editions and translations, notably those into Latin and into Italian, of Josephus, as well as editions of Josippon.

### 2.3: Dissertations on Jewish Subjects

- (13) WOLFDIETER BIHL: *Bibliographie der Dissertationen über Judentum und jüdische Persönlichkeiten, die 1872–1962 an österreichischen Hochschulen (Wien, Graz, Innsbruck) approbiert wurden.* Wien 1965.
- (13a) WITA RAVID and PHYLLIS DISENHOUSE, edd.: *Doctoral Dissertations and Master's Theses Accepted by American Institutions of Higher Learning, 1963–68 (Guides to Jewish Subjects in Social and Humanistic Research, 1–8).* 8 vols. New York, YIVO, 1966–78.
- (13b) WOLFDIETER BIHL: *Bibliographie der österreichischen Hochschulschriften über Judentum und jüdische Persönlichkeiten 1962–1974.* Wien 1976.

BIHL (13), who, in his brief, fifty-one-page work, subdivides the dissertations on Judaism topically, has nothing directly on Josephus; but he does list several dissertations dealing with the period of history covered by him.

RAVID (13a) has a list of dissertations in the Jewish field which, unfortunately, has many omissions. The arrangement is according to subject area, but gives only the author and title and the university which awarded the degree, with no indication of the contents or even of the date when the degree was awarded.

BIHL (13b), in his list of Austrian dissertations pertaining to Judaism, has only one item pertaining to ancient Jewish history: ALFRED SEMPER, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der jüdischen Gemeinde Palästinas in der persischen Zeit*, 2 vols. Diss., Wien 1966.

## 2.4: Indices of Jewish *Festschriften*

- (14) JACOB MARCUS and ALBERT BILGRAY: *An Index to Jewish Festschriften*. Cincinnati 1937.
- (15) CHARLES BERLIN: *Index to Festschriften in Jewish Studies*. Cambridge, Mass. 1971.

It is notorious that when articles are published in *Festschriften* they often become lost to scholarship because they are usually not part of a regular series. Hence we are particularly fortunate in the field of Judaica to have the index by article, title, and subject of MARCUS and BILGRAY (14), listing articles in fifty-three *Festschriften* up to 1936, as supplemented by BERLIN (15) up to 1970, listing articles in 243 *Festschriften*, including many issued before 1936 and missed by MARCUS and BILGRAY.

## 2.5: Annual Classical Bibliographies

- (16) JULES MAROUZEAU: *L'Année philologique: Bibliographie critique et analytique de l'Antiquité Gréco-Latine*. Vol. 1, 1924–26, Paris 1928. Most recent volume, edited by JULIETTE ERNST et al., vol. 50, 1979, Paris 1981.
- (17) ISTVÁN BORZSÁK: *A magyar klasszika-filológiai irodalom bibliográfiája 1926–50*. Budapest 1952.
- (18) GABRIELA PIANKO: *Filologia klasyczna w Polsce. Bibliografia za lata 1945–1949*. Warsaw 1952.
- (19) GABRIELA PIANKO: *Filologia klasyczna w Polsce. Bibliografia za lata 1950–1954*. Warsaw 1958.
- (20) KAREL SVOBODA: *Bibliografie českých a slovenských prací o antice za léta 1901–1950*. Prague 1961.
- (21) LADISLAV VIDMAN: *Bibliografie řeckých a latinských studií v Československu za léta 1951–1960*. Prague 1966.
- (21a) PETER A. HANSEN: *A Bibliography of Danish Contributions to Classical Scholarship from the Sixteenth Century to 1970*. *Danish Humanist Texts and Studies*, vol. 1, edited by the Royal Library, Copenhagen. Copenhagen 1977.

Many years of experience with the chief current classical bibliography, MAROUZEAU (16), '*L'Année Philologique*', have convinced the author that though its coverage has improved greatly through the years, it misses many items in the Biblical and especially the Jewish fields, as well as items in books and periodicals that are not primarily classical. Moreover, it appears about two years after the year covered in its annual bibliographies. Yet its summaries of articles in a sentence or two and its listing of reviews of books (though the latter is spotty) are invaluable aids.

'The Year's Work in Classical Studies', which appeared until 1947, contains almost nothing on Josephus.

Inasmuch as items published in smaller countries are often not covered in '*L'Année Philologique*', it is useful to have the unannotated compilations of BORZSÁK (17) for Hungarian classical publications for the years 1926–1950; PIANKO (18) (19) for Polish publications for the years 1945–1949 and 1950–1954; and SVOBODA (20) and VIDMAN (21) for Czechoslovakian publications for the years 1901–1950 and 1951–1960 respectively.

HANSEN (21a), pp. 61–62, lists six items published by Danish scholars pertaining to Josephus, with occasional descriptive notes.

## 2.6: Annual Biblical Bibliographies

(21b) PETER NOBER, ed., *Biblica. Elenchus Bibliographicus*. Rome 1920ff.

(21c) Old Testament Abstracts. Catholic Biblical Association. 1978–present.

(21d) PAUL-ÉMILE LANGEVIN: *Bibliographie Biblique*, vol. 1: 1930–1970: Quebec 1972; vol. 2: Quebec 1979.

‘*Biblica*’ (21b), in its annual ‘*Elenchus Bibliographicus*: XX, § 3, s. v. *Philo et Iosephus*’, starting in 1920, very fragmentary before 1952 but increasingly fuller since then, is particularly useful for church and, to some extent, Jewish periodicals often omitted by ‘*L’Année Philologique*’. But while it lists reviews of books (very spotty in this, however), it does not contain summaries of articles, and it is less than comprehensive for items in Hebrew.

A new publication, ‘Old Testament Abstracts’ (21c) has appeared since February, 1978, on a thrice-yearly basis. It follows the format of the highly useful ‘New Testament Abstracts’ in giving summaries of articles from a large number of journals, but it is not exhaustive.

LANGEVIN (21d), in volume 1, presents systematic analyses of articles on the Bible from seventy Roman Catholic journals. In volume 2, he goes beyond denominational criteria and includes fifty other journals (clearly far from complete coverage), as well as books, which he summarizes chapter by chapter. In particular, attention should be called to volume 1, pp. 232–235, which summarizes items pertaining to Judaism at the time of Jesus, and pp. 235–236, on Hellenism; and to volume 2, pp. 557–564, on the Jewish cultural and religious milieu of the New Testament; and pp. 564–568, on Hellenism. There are also numerous items pertaining to individual books of the Bible which comment on Josephus’ treatment of these books.

## 2.7: Annual Jewish Bibliographies

(22) ISSACHAR JOEL, ed.: *Index of Articles on Jewish Studies* (in Hebrew and English). Jerusalem 1969 (for the year 1966) ff.

(23) MIRIAM LEIKIND, ed.: *Index to Jewish Periodicals*. Cleveland 1963ff.

(23a) ELHANAN ADLER, JOSEPH YERUSHALMI, and KANIYA FLEISHER, edd.: *Index to Hebrew Periodicals 1977* (in Hebrew). 2 vols. Jerusalem, University of Haifa Center for Public Libraries in Israel, 1978.

For the Jewish field two relatively new bibliographical aids may be mentioned. The annual *Index of Articles on Jewish Studies* (22) is very incomplete for Jewish history of the period of the Second Temple and for Josephus studies generally but quite thorough for Hebrew items.

The semi-annual *Index to Jewish Periodicals* (23) covers only forty-three periodicals, all in English and mostly of a popular or a semi-popular nature.

The older annual bibliography, published since 1924 in the periodical 'Kirjath Sefer' by the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, is very spotty in its coverage of Josephus but does contain excellent reviews in Hebrew, often at great length, of important works.

ADLER, YERUSHALMI, and FLEISHER (23a), vol. 1, p. 337, list only one item under 'Josef ben Mattityahu' and one item (p. 357) under 'Josippon.'

## 2.8: Collected Bibliographies of Jewish Studies Aiming at Completeness

(24) PETER THOMSEN, ed.: *Die Palästina-Literatur; eine internationale Bibliographie in systematischer Ordnung*. 6 vols. Berlin 1908–1956.

(24a) GIORGIO ROMANO: *Bibliografia Italo-Ebraica (1848–1977)* (Biblioteca di bibliografia Italiana, 88). Firenze 1979.

Among collected bibliographies which aim at completeness we may note THOMSEN (24), which in six volumes covers the period down to 1939, the latest surveying the years 1935 through 1939 (Josephus on pp. 281–288); but, as a glance at SCHRECKENBERG's bibliography for these years (as supplemented in the present work) shows, there are numerous omissions. Moreover, no attempt is made to differentiate significant from insignificant works. The author and subject indices are helpful, but an index of passages would have enhanced the work.

ROMANO (24a), pp. 135–137, 143–146, and 157, includes bibliography for items pertaining to Josephus which have been translated into Italian.

## 2.9: Selective Bibliographies Pertaining to Josephus through the Nineteenth Century

(25) EMIL SCHÜRER: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Vol. 1, 4th ed. Leipzig 1901. Pp. 102–106.

(26) EMIL SCHÜRER: Josephus. In: *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 9, 1901, pp. 377–386.

(27) JEAN JUSTER: *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain*. Vol. 1. Paris 1914. Pp. 7–13.

Of the selective bibliographies covering the nineteenth century the best by far is that by SCHÜRER (25) in his famous work, supplemented by his article (26).

JUSTER (27), an English translation (and revision) of which is being prepared by SHAYE J. COHEN, has a good listing that supplements SCHÜRER in many places.

## 2.10: Selective Bibliographies Pertaining to Josephus for the Twentieth Century

(29) EMIL SCHÜRER: *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*, ed. by NAHUM N. GLATZER. New York 1961.

(29) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*, ed. by NAHUM N. GLATZER. New York 1972.

- (30) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.—A.D. 135), ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973.
- (31) GUY T. GRIFFITH: *The Greek Historians*. In: MAURICE PLATNAUER, ed., *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship*. 2nd ed., Oxford 1968. Pp. 182–241.
- (32) RALPH MARCUS: *Selected Bibliography (1920–1945) of the Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. In: *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 16, 1946–47, pp. 97–181.
- (33) URIEL RAPPAPORT: *Bibliography of Works on Jewish History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, 1946–1970*. In: B. ODED et al., edd.: *Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel* (in Hebrew) 2. Haifa 1972. Pp. 247–321. (Originally issued in mimeographed form as: *A Selected Bibliography of Jewish History in the Period of the Second Temple*. 2nd printing with addenda, Haifa 1969).
- (34) GERHARD DELLING: *Bibliographie zur Jüdisch-Hellenistischen und Intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900–1965* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 106). Berlin 1969.
- (34a) GERHARD DELLING: *Bibliographie zur Jüdisch-Hellenistischen und Intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900–1970 in Verbindung mit MALWINE MASER*, 2nd ed. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 106<sup>2</sup>). Berlin 1975.
- (34b) URIEL RAPPAPORT (in collaboration with MENAHEM MOR): *Bibliography of Works on Jewish History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, 1971–1975*. The Institute for Advanced Studies, The Hebrew University, 1976; mimeographed, in Hebrew and English.

The first division of SCHÜRER has been issued as a paperback in an abridged English translation and contains a selected bibliography by GLATZER (28), pp. 409–416, for the years 1900–1960, good for archaeological material but spotty for historical, religious, and literary matters. A second volume edited by GLATZER (29) contains the unabridged text of SCHÜRER's volume 3 of the Second Division, to which GLATZER has added a bibliography for the years 1900–1970, primarily on the Apocrypha. In 1973 VERMES and MILLAR (30) with a number of collaborators, presented the first of three volumes of a completely revised and updated SCHÜRER, with excellent selective bibliographies for each chapter; the section on Josephus (pp. 43–61) is followed by a brief but carefully chosen bibliography, arranged according to topic. Nonetheless, the old SCHÜRER often remains useful on particular points.

In his first edition of 1954 PLATNAUER (31) had a chapter by GRIFFITH, pp. 180–192, which, though going up to Dio Cassius and Arrian, incredibly omitted Josephus completely. In the second and considerably modified edition, GRIFFITH, in a supplement of some length, gives a solitary reference to Josephus, the present author's 'Scholarship on Philo and Josephus (1937–1962).'

MARCUS (32) lists, without comment, all important books and articles (helpful for noting, with a single asterisk, those books — rarely articles — which are useful introductions, and, with a double asterisk, those books or articles that are indispensable to the specialist). The section on Josephus (pp. 178–181) shows considerable discernment; but some items of great merit are omitted, and others which are included have relatively little on the subject.

RAPPAPORT (33) is a continuation of Marcus. The subject headings have been subdivided to a much greater degree, and this feature, together with the indices, improves its usefulness. RAPPAPORT employs a single asterisk for a work which includes bibliography and a double asterisk for a work which is



itself a bibliography. The many typographical errors in the mimeographed version have been almost entirely eliminated in the printed version, but the mimeographed version does occasionally list reviews and warnings, which are totally missing in the printed version. RAPPAPORT is much less full than DELLING for the earlier period, but he is strong for the more recent period, particularly for items written in Hebrew. He is especially useful in noting works with important bibliographies. For Josephus the listing is, even for a selective bibliography, far from complete and often omits important works.

DELLING (34), like RAPPAPORT and unlike MARCUS, gives no indication of the relative importance of the items cited. The items on Josephus (pp. 51–60) are a mixed bag and include some very minor items while omitting more important ones. Rarely are reviews indicated.

DELLING (34a) has issued a new, much enlarged edition, adding about 700 items for the years 1966–1970, as well as an approximately equal number of items for the years 1900–1965 that had been omitted from the first edition. The entries on Josephus directly appear on pages 80–94. He is most helpful in listing reprints of works published before 1900, but unfortunately he omits works in Hebrew that have not been translated into European languages.

RAPPAPORT (34b) has continued his valuable, classified bibliography, with much more coverage of Josephus (pp. 51–54) than in his previous bibliographies.

## 2.11: Regularly Appearing Annotated Bibliographies of Hellenistic Judaism

(34c) *Internationale Zeitschriftenschau Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete*, ed. F. STIER. Düsseldorf 1951ff.

(34d) *New Testament Abstracts*, ed. DANIEL J. HARRINGTON. Cambridge, Mass. 1956ff.

(34e) *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, ed. ADAM S. VAN DER WOUDE. Leiden 1970ff.

(34f) *Revue de Qumran*, ed. JEAN CARMIGNAC. Paris 1958ff.

(34g) *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, ed. GEORG FOHRER. Berlin 1881ff.

(34h) *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, ed. EDUARD LOHSE. Berlin 1900ff.

The 'Internationale Zeitschriftenschau' (34c) contains very brief summaries of articles under the headings 'Geschichte Israels: Exil bis Bar Kochba' and 'Judentum: Philo-Josephus'.

'New Testament Abstracts' (34d) contains somewhat fuller summaries of articles, as well as of books, together with summaries of important reviews of books. Its coverage is the most comprehensive and most prompt (and ever expanding) for articles, and, to a lesser degree, for books in the field of Hellenistic Judaism.

The fullest summaries for individual items will be found in the 'Journal for the Study of Judaism' (34e), which, however, covers far fewer periodicals.

The 'Revue de Qumran' (34f), which appears at somewhat irregular intervals, lists, in most issues, books, dissertations, and articles pertaining to the Dead Sea Scrolls, but without summaries.

The 'Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft' (34g) and the 'Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft' (34h) have very brief summaries of articles in a limited number of periodicals.

The summaries in all of these journals are rarely critical.

## 2.12: Brief Selective Bibliographies of Hellenistic Judaism

- (35) HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY: *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*. Chicago 1947. Pp. 32–51.
- (36) JUDAH GOLDIN: *On a Selective Bibliography in English for the Study of Judaism*. In: CHARLES J. ADAMS, ed., *A Reader's Guide to the Great Religions*. New York 1965. Pp. 191–228.
- (37) RICHARD BAVIER: *Judaism in New Testament Times*. In: RICHARD BAVIER et al., *The Study of Judaism: Bibliographical Essays*. New York 1972. Pp. 7–34.
- (38) MARCEL SIMON and ANDRÉ BENOIT: *Le Judaïsme et le Christianisme antique d'Antiochus Épiphane à Constantin* (Nouvelle Clio, 10). Paris 1968.
- (38a) WERNER BAIER: *Liturgie und Kult in der frühjüdischen Welt und Umwelt*. In: *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 19, 1978, pp. 175–192.
- (38b) GÜNTER MAYER: *Zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur*. In: *Theologische Rundschau* 44, 1979, pp. 197–226; 45, 1980, pp. 226–244.

The work of WILLOUGHBY (35), which discusses briefly six books on Josephus, none of which appeared after 1932, is disappointing. GOLDIN's brief work (36) is a highly selective, fair, critical bibliography of the major works in the general field of Judaism and includes Josephus as well. BAVIER (37) has highly selective summaries, but is skimpy in his coverage and is almost never critical. A work that includes MILTON STEINBERG's novel 'As A Driven Leaf' while omitting the 'Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum' of TCHERIKOVER, FUKS, and STERN cannot be taken seriously. The first third of SIMON-BENOIT (38) consists of a comprehensive bibliography, giving first the primary sources, including archaeological, epigraphic, numismatic, and literary sources, followed by a general bibliography, often with brief descriptive notes and warnings as to bias.

BAIER (38a) contains descriptions and evaluations of about a paragraph, often highly critical, for each of 125 books dealing with worship in Hellenistic Judaism under four categories: *Festschriften*, histories of the period, archaeology, and writers (including Josephus) and religious movements of the period.

MAYER (38b) surveys a number of recent series of volumes dealing with Hellenistic Judaism and comments, in particular, on fragments of Hellenistic Jewish literature quoted by Josephus and others. In his second survey he includes nine books on Josephus.

## 2.13: Specialized Bibliographies in Areas Covered by or Related to Josephus: the Septuagint

- (39) SEBASTIAN P. BROCK, CHARLES T. FRITSCH, SIDNEY JELlicoe: *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*. Leiden 1973.

Inasmuch as for the first half of the 'Antiquities' Josephus' chief source is the Bible, especially in the Septuagint version, bibliographies of the Septuagint often deal with Josephus' value for determining the text of the Septuagint and the relationship of Josephus' text to the Lucianic version which he seems to anticipate. We now have BROCK-FRITSCH-JELlicoe (39), which lists (pp. 58–59) the major contributions on the theme of Josephus' Septuagint down to 1969; but it omits several works that deal with the subject directly and numerous works that deal with this matter less directly, particularly for the period before 1900, even though it claims to include everything or nearly everything of importance.

## 2.14: Specialized Bibliographies: the New Testament

- (40) GEORGE S. GLANZMAN and JOSEPH A. FITZMYER: An Introductory Bibliography for the Study of Scripture (Woodstock Papers, no. 5). Westminster, Maryland, 1961; rev. ed., Rome 1981.
- (41) WILLIAM N. LYONS and MERRILL M. PARVIS, ed.: New Testament Literature: An Annotated Bibliography. Vol. 1. Chicago 1948.
- (42) BRUCE M. METZGER: Index to Periodical Literature on Christ and the Gospels. Leiden 1966.
- (43) ANDREW J. MATTILL and MARY B. MATTILL: A Classified Bibliography of Literature on the Acts of the Apostles. Leiden 1966.
- (44) BRUCE M. METZGER: Index of Articles on the New Testament and the Early Church Published in *Festschriften* (Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 5). Philadelphia 1951; supplement, Philadelphia 1955.
- (44a) FRÉDÉRIC MANNS: Bibliographie zu Judéo-Christianisme (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta, 13). Jerusalem 1979.

For the Jewish Scriptures and especially for the New Testament GLANZMAN and FITZMYER (40) have valuable, impartial annotations of two or three sentences about each work, with frequent warnings to the reader; but there is little directly on Josephus.

LYONS and PARVIS (41) seek to present an exhaustive bibliography on the New Testament and related fields which appeared in the years from 1943 to 1945, plus items that appeared in 1940–1942 which were not included in earlier publications. For Josephus only eight items are mentioned, with occasional summaries: the work is clearly very incomplete.

METZGER (42) includes (pp. 387–389) an entry on Josephus and the Gospel tradition, dealing especially with the 'Testimonium Flavianum' (Ant. Jud. 18. 63–64) and, to a lesser degree, with the relationship of Luke and Josephus. His bibliography on these subjects is, however, far from complete.

MATTILL and MATTILL (43) have a classified bibliography dealing only with Acts; the section dealing with Josephus' relation with Acts is relatively complete but still has a number of omissions.

For the many articles on or alluding to Josephus in New Testament-oriented *Festschriften* we are indebted to METZGER (44), but he has missed several where the references to Josephus are not apparent from the title.

MANNS (44a) lists 1914 items on the literary sources of Jewish Christianity, general treatments of the subject, theology, exegesis, archaeology, and Christianity in its milieu.

### 2.15: Specialized Bibliographies: Philo

- (45) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *The Politics of Philo Judaeus, Practice and Theory*, with a General Bibliography of Philo by HOWARD L. GOODHART and ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. New Haven 1938; rpt. Hildesheim 1967.
- (46) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Scholarship on Philo and Josephus (1937–1962)* (Yeshiva University, Studies in Judaica, 1). New York 1963.
- (47) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1963–1970*. In: *Studia Philonica* 1, 1972, pp. 57–71.
- (48) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies in 1971, with Additions for 1963–70*. In: *Studia Philonica* 2, 1973, pp. 51–54.
- (48a) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1972–1973*. In: *Studia Philonica* 3, 1974–75, pp. 117–125.
- (48b) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1974–1975*. In: *Studia Philonica* 4, 1976–77, pp. 79–85. [See *infra*, p. 899.]

Since Josephus is the only Jewish author who mentions Philo until the sixteenth century and inasmuch as there is good reason to believe that Philo had direct or indirect influence on Josephus both in the ‘Antiquities’ and especially in ‘Against Apion’, bibliographies of Philo sometimes contain references to this relationship. The standard bibliography by GOODHART and GOODENOUGH (45), which has no comments but which does list many but far from all reviews, misses many of the works that discuss this relationship.

My own critical bibliography (46) continues from the point where GOODHART and GOODENOUGH end; on it see my corrigenda in ‘*Studia Philonica*’ 1, 1972, p. 56.

HILGERT (47) (48) covers the period from 1963 to 1971 but without comments; and issues of ‘*Studia Philonica*’ starting with volume 2 contain abstracts of articles on Philo. If, all in all, one will find relatively few references to correspondences between Philo and Josephus it is because the subject remains largely unexplored.

HILGERT (48a) (48b) brings his bibliography up through 1975. This is a mere listing, though unusually complete. The issues of ‘*Studia Philonica*’ elsewhere give paragraph-long summaries of some of the items.

### 2.16: Specialized Bibliographies: the Essenes, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Slavonic Josephus (see also 22.10)

- (49) SIEGFRIED WAGNER: *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine wissenschaftliche Studie*. Berlin 1960.
- (50) GÖSTA LINDESKOG: *Die Essenerfrage in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 1, 1962, pp. 96–108.
- (51) WILLIAM S. LASOR: *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948–1957* (Fuller Library Bulletin, no. 31). Pasadena, California 1958.
- (52) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften von Toten Meer (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 76 and 89)*. Vol. 1, nr. 1–1556, Berlin 1957; vol. 2, nr. 1557–4459, Berlin 1965.
- (53) MICHAEL YIZHAR: *Bibliography of Hebrew Publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1964* (Harvard Theological Studies, 23). Cambridge, Mass. 1967.

- (54) BASTIAAN JONGELING: A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah, 1958–1969 (JOHANNES VAN DER PLOEG, ed., *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, vol. 7). Leiden 1971.
- (55) JAMES A. SANDERS: Palestinian Manuscripts 1947–1967. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86, 1967, pp. 431–444.
- (56) JAMES A. SANDERS: Palestinian Manuscripts 1947–1972. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 24, 1973, pp. 74–83.
- (57) HERBERT BRAUN: *Qumran und das Neue Testament*. 2 vols. Tübingen 1966.
- (58) HANS BARDTKE: Qumran und seine Probleme. In: *Theologische Rundschau* 33, 1968, pp. 97–119.
- (59) ROBERT EISLER: *The Messiah Jesus* (trans. into English by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE of his ΙΗCOΥC ΒΑCΙΑΕΥC ΟΥ ΒΑCΙΑΕΥCΑC). London 1931. Pp. 624–630. (Cf. below, no. [81].)
- (59a) ANTONIO G. LAMADRID: *Los descubrimientos del Mar Muerto. Balance de veinticinco años de hallazgos y estudio*. Madrid 1971.
- (59b) ALFRED ADAM, ed.: *Antike Berichte über die Essener*, 2nd ed. by CHRISTOPH BURCHARD. Berlin 1972.
- (59c) JAMES A. SANDERS: *The Dead Sea Scrolls – A Quarter Century of Study*. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 36, 1973, pp. 109–148.
- (59d) JOSEPH A. FITZMYER: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (*Sources for Biblical Study*, no. 8; Society of Biblical Literature). Missoula, Montana 1975.
- (59e) HERBERT HAAG: *Kult, Liturgie und Gemeindeleben in Qumran*. In: *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 17–18, 1975–76, pp. 222–239.

The section in Josephus, *Jewish War* 2. 119–161, which is the chief source of our knowledge of the Essenes, has been subject to a tremendous discussion, the most important items of which have been summarized and extensively appraised by WAGNER (49), who notes the trends in the scholarship until the year 1947, when the Dead Sea Scrolls were first discovered. LINDESKOG (50) continues where WAGNER ends and discusses the Essenes in the light of these new finds.

The continuing discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls since 1947 has led to a vast bibliography documented in almost every issue of *Revue de Qumran* since 1958 and collected by LASOR (51), BURCHARD (52), and YIZHAR (53). LASOR, covering the period to 1957, has a long but far from exhaustive section (pp. 71–73: nos. 3100–3154) on the Essenes, for whom Josephus is the chief source and with whom the Dead Sea Sect has been identified by many scholars.

JONGELING (54) continues at the point where LASOR ends, but he has not sufficiently subdivided the subject into classifications, has many omissions, and lacks annotation.

The most comprehensive bibliography, that by BURCHARD (52), in his first volume, embracing 1556 items, covers the period to 1957; his second, with 2902 items, reaches 1962. Unfortunately articles in modern Greek and in Hebrew (the latter often the most significant ones) are in separate sections. There is regrettably no classification according to topics but rather only according to the particular Qumran text being commented upon, an unfortunate arrangement, since so many of the articles deal with several of the texts.

SANDERS (55) (56) presents lists of where photographs and responsible transcriptions of the Dead Sea manuscripts have been published, as well as a brief

list of study aids. SANDERS' second publication follows the format of his first but rectifies the order of manuscripts found in Caves 4 and 11.

YIZHAR (53) has almost three hundred items in Hebrew, unknown to many Western scholars, arranged according to subject, with many entries accompanied by brief descriptive notices.

An extensive classified bibliography on the Essenes, particularly in relation to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, will be found in BRAUN (57).

BARDTKE (58) presents a survey of the scholarship, particularly of the previous decade, dealing with the scrolls, and especially with the problem of whether to identify the sect with the Essenes or with the Zealots.

On the Slavonic Josephus there is a very full bibliography, especially on the passages referring to Jesus and John, in EISLER (59).

I have not seen LAMADRID's (59a) analysis of the first quarter of a century of scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

ADAM's (59b) bibliography on the Essenes has been brought up to date by BURCHARD, who is particularly concerned with the relationship of the Essenes to the Dead Sea Sect.

SANDERS (59c) presents a critical analysis of the literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls. He summarizes (pp. 125–127) Josephus' references to the Essenes.

FITZMYER (59d) has a bibliography which is very useful, being selective and classified.

HAAG (59e) summarizes a number of books and articles that appeared during 1969–1971 under the topics of bibliography, texts, the origin and organization of the Qumran community, the identification of the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes, the celibacy and asceticism of the Sect, their theology, and the relation of the Sect to Christianity.

## 2.17: Specialized Bibliographies: Bibliographies of Individual Scholars

(60) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: Solomon Zeitlin: Scholar Laureate. New York 1971.

Among scholars who have devoted attention to Josephus, SOLOMON ZEITLIN, controversial though he be, must be counted among the most original and the most provocative. The tribute edited by his pupil HOENIG (60) contains, in addition to chapters sympathetically evaluating ZEITLIN's contributions to various fields, brief uncritical summaries of 406 items published by ZEITLIN between 1915 and 1970, almost all of them dealing with the period of the Second Temple.

## 2.18: Bibliographies Devoted Specifically to Josephus

(61) FRIEDRICH REUSS: Bericht über die griechischen Historiker: Josephus. In: Bursian, Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 142, 1909, pp. 159–163.

- (62) ALBERT DEBRUNNER: Bericht über die Literatur zum nachklassischen Griechisch aus den Jahren 1907–1929. In: Bursian, Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 236, 1932, p. 197: Josephus und Philo.
- (63) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums, 1). Leiden 1968.
- (64) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Scholarship on Philo and Josephus (1937–1962) (Yeshiva University, Studies in Judaica, 1). New York 1963.
- (65) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 6, Jewish Antiquities, Books IX–XI (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1937.
- (66) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 7, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1943.
- (67) RALPH MARCUS and ALLEN WIKGREN, edd. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 8, Jewish Antiquities, Books XV–XVII (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1963.
- (68) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1965.
- (68a) URIEL RAPPAPORT: Josephus Flavius: A Help Manual for Class (in Hebrew). Haifa (Haifa University) 1971.
- (68b) ARTHUR A. CHIEL: The Kohut Judaic Collection at Yale. In: JONATHAN D. SARNA, ed., Jews in New Haven. New Haven, Jewish Historical Society, 1978. Pp. 80–94.
- (68c) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus: Supplementband mit Gesamtregister (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums, vol. 14). Leiden 1979.
- (68d) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: A Supplement to Heinz Schreckenberg's Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus. In progress.

The last critical survey in the Jahresbericht series is by REUSS (61) and covers the years 1905–1908. On the language of Josephus the most recent survey is by DEBRUNNER (62) covering the years 1907–1929, which is far from attaining its goal of complete coverage.

We must all be grateful to SCHRECKENBERG (63) for his year-by-year listing starting with 1470, the year of the *editio princeps*, to 1968, with systematic coverage through 1965. For most items SCHRECKENBERG gives brief, though almost never critical, summaries. He classifies the items according to a scheme of twenty-five categories, far too few for a bibliography as vast as that of Josephus; thus, for example, one category encompasses the entire area of historical personalities and events, another Josephus' views on Judaism, etc. Many items are left unclassified, either because the author had not seen them or could not find a niche for them within his scheme. Many are left without any summary of contents. As it stands, the bibliography is useful for the student of the history of Josephan scholarship, since it shows the direction which studies have taken through the years. But most modern scholars find an arrangement by subject matter, such as is employed by DOUGLAS E. GERBER, A Bibliography of Pindar 1513–1966 (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, no. 28; Cleveland 1969), more useful. SCHRECKENBERG seldom lists reviews, except for a few of the longest and most important ones. Moreover, on related subjects, such as Hegesippus and Josippon (Josephon), works are sometimes, but not systematically, included. The reader will find numerous question marks, particularly for the older entries, indicating that the author was unable to verify the entries. While it is true, as the greatest of Jewish bibliographers MORITZ

STEINSCHNEIDER once remarked, that such works are terminated only by the binder, it is disappointing to note that there are numerous errors in the entries, as well as in the otherwise useful indices of names and passages, and many hundreds of omissions which the present author has compiled and which await publication. In sum, if the criteria of a bibliography are completeness, accuracy, and ease of consultation, this bibliography does not meet optimum standards.

My own bibliography (64), though limited in years covered, because of its arrangement by subject matter and its critical appraisals, is hopefully easier to use, especially for those not thoroughly acquainted with the field. Though it attempted to be complete, there were numerous omissions, which the present work seeks to remedy.

In the last four volumes of the Loeb series there are selective bibliographies on a number of subjects. In volume 6 MARCUS (65) has bibliographies on the Samaritan schism (Ant. 11. 297–347) and on Alexander the Great and the Jews (Ant. 11. 317–345), as well as detailed critical discussions of the literature.

In volume 7 MARCUS (66) has selective bibliographies and critical discussions of the date of the High Priest Simon the Just (the Righteous), the early Seleucid rulers and the Jews, and Antiochus III and the Jews (Ant. 12. 129–153). There are also bibliographies without comment on the Oniads and Tobiads and Palestine under Ptolemaic rule (Ant. 12. 154–236), Spartans and Jews (Ant. 12. 226–227, 13. 164–170), the background of the Maccabean revolt, the Seleucid Era in I and II Maccabees and the chronology of the Hasmonean period, Antiochus Epiphanes and the Samaritans (Ant. 12. 257–264), the Hellenistic and Roman decrees in Antiquities 12–14, the Hasmoneans in rabbinic tradition, the status of Judaea under Roman rule 63–37 B. C. E., and Hasmonean coinage.

MARCUS and WIKGREN (67) in volume 8 have a general bibliography for the period covered in Antiquities 15–17, as well as a selective, briefly annotated bibliography on Herod the Great's building program; these bibliographies unfortunately contain numerous errors in citations and sometimes include items of only the most marginal relevance while omitting others of much greater significance.

In volume 9 (68) I have included selective bibliographies on the following subjects: Quirinius' assessment (Ant. 18. 1), the Pharisees and the Sadducees (Ant. 18. 12–17), the Essenes (Ant. 18. 18–22), the Fourth Philosophy (Ant. 18. 23–25), the Samaritans (Ant. 18. 29–30, 85–87, etc.), the Roman procurators (except Pontius Pilate) (Ant. 18. 31–35, etc.), Parthian affairs (Ant. 18. 39–52, etc.), the incident of the Emperor's standards (Ant. 18. 55–59), Pontius Pilate, especially his dismissal from the procuratorship (Ant. 18. 60–62, 85–89), the "Testimonium Flavianum" (Ant. 18. 63–64), the expulsion of the Jews by Tiberius (Ant. 18. 65–84), the death of John the Baptist (Ant. 18. 116–119), Agrippa I (Ant. 18. 143ff.), the Emperor Gaius' dealings with the Jews (Ant. 18. 257ff.), the sources of Book 19, the citizenship of the Alexandrian Jews and Claudius' edict (Ant. 19. 280–285), the conversion of King Izates and the Adiabeniensians to Judaism (Ant. 20. 17–96), and the high priests during the first century of the Christian Era (Ant. 18. 26ff. and especially 20. 224–251). I have



prefixed a double asterisk to those items indispensable for the specialist and a single asterisk to those works presenting an especially good introductory survey.

RAPPAPORT (68a) has a selected bibliography for a course in Josephus.

CHIEL (68b), p. 92, comments on the remarkable addition made to the Yale University Library in 1915 of the impressively sizable collection of 1500 volumes pertaining to Josephus that had been personally acquired by Dr. SELAH MERRILL, United States consul in Jerusalem.

SCHRECKENBERG (68c) has brought his bibliography up to date (there are few entries after 1977), including numerous items for the period until 1966 that he had omitted in his previous bibliography. He uses the same method of classification; but instead of a year-by-year bibliography he has arranged all items alphabetically and has separated text editions and items of fiction based on Josephus, as well as items pertaining to the versions, from his main list. The descriptions of the items vary greatly in length and value, and for some items there is no description at all. SCHRECKENBERG is of particular value in noting references to particular passages in Josephus that are discussed. He has corrected a number of errors in his previous edition, but many still remain; and, despite all his efforts, he has omitted many items, though few of major importance. There are combined indices for the authors in chronological order and in alphabetical order. It is most unfortunate, however, that SCHRECKENBERG has omitted indices of citations and of Greek words, such as he has in his original bibliography.

The bibliography which I (68d) am compiling continues where SCHRECKENBERG ends. It also includes numerous items omitted by SCHRECKENBERG both in his original bibliography and in his supplement. An attempt has been made to make the summaries more systematic than those in SCHRECKENBERG.

### 3: The Text

#### 3.0: Editions of the Greek Text

- (69) BENEDICT NIESE, ed.: *Flavii Iosephi opera*. 7 vols. Berlin 1885–95; rpt. 1955 (= *editio maior*)
- (70) BENEDICT NIESE, ed.: *Flavii Iosephi opera*. 6 vols. Berlin 1888–95 (= *editio minor*).
- (71) SAMUEL A. NABER, ed.: *Flavii Iosephi opera omnia post IMMANUELEM BEKKERUM*. 6 vols. Leipzig 1888–96.
- (72) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, RALPH MARCUS, ALLEN WIKGREN, LOUIS H. FELDMAN, edd. and trans.: *Josephus*, 9 vols. Cambridge, Mass. (Loeb Classical Library), 1926–65.
- (73) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes*. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (74) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed.: *Documents for the History of the Diaspora in the Period of the Second Temple from the 'Antiquitates Judaicae', Books 14–16*. Jerusalem 1957.
- (75) KOSTAS I. PHRINLINGOS: *Φλαβίου Ἰωσήπου Κατ' Ἀπίωνος*. Athens 1939.
- (76) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Reconstruction of the Greek Text of Contra Apionem* 2. 51–113 (unpublished).
- (76a) VICTOR EHRENBERG and ARNOLD H. M. JONES, edd.: *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*. Oxford 1949.

The standard editions of Josephus remain those that were issued almost simultaneously by NIESE (69)(70) and NABER (71). The former has a much fuller apparatus criticus in his *editio maior*; and indeed both NABER and the Loeb edition of THACKERAY et al. (72) depend upon it. It is close to the manuscript tradition and is generally, and with good reason, more widely accepted. It should be noted, nevertheless, that NIESE's *editio minor* (70) changes the text of the *editio maior* (69) in several hundred passages, though often it is unnecessarily bold; it rates, nevertheless, as NIESE's final edition. NIESE, however, in line with the prevailing principle in text criticism of his time, overestimated the value of one group of manuscripts, for example RO for Antiquities 1–10, and frequently failed to consider the quality of individual readings case by case. Consequently, all too often, as SCHRECKENBERG (73) remarks, the best textual tradition appears in NIESE's apparatus.

NABER's (71) text may be smoother generally than that of NIESE, especially when compared with the latter's *editio maior*, but the task of the editor, of course, is to reconstruct what Josephus wrote rather than to improve his Greek. NABER's edition, and especially his apparatus criticus, are, moreover, full of errors.

So far as the Greek text is concerned, the Loeb version of THACKERAY et al. (72) is not only derived from NIESE but is often unreliable in doing so,

especially in citing the Epitome. Under MARCUS and FELDMAN the Loeb edition did, however, incorporate a number of emendations; and, in any case, in notes much fuller than those found in THACKERAY's volumes, they often explain the reasons for their choice of readings.

SCHALIT (74) presents, without comment or translation, portions of the Greek text of documents in Books 14–16 of the 'Antiquities' to illustrate the lectures in his seminar at the Hebrew University.

PHRINLINGOS (75) has an edition of the Greek text of 'Against Apion', together with an introduction, translation into modern Greek, and commentary.

SHUTT (76) has reconstructed the Greek, using Josephus' idiom and language, for the passage in 'Against Apion' (2. 51–113) which has survived only in the Latin version. Inasmuch as the Latin translation misunderstood the Greek in a number of places, this translation is especially valuable in reconstructing the original text.

EHRENBERG and JONES (76a), pp. 129–135, have the Greek texts, without commentary, of Antiquities 16. 162–165, 166, 167–168, 169–170, 171, and 172–173.

### 3.1: Transmission of the Text

- (77) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, trans.: Joseph ben Mattityahu, Kadmoniot Hayyehudim (trans. into Hebrew of 'Antiquities'). Vol. 3 (Books 11–20). Jerusalem 1963.
- (78) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (79) SHLOMO PINES: An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities: Section of Humanities). Jerusalem 1971.
- (80) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter. Leiden 1972.
- (81) ROBERT EISLER: *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*, Die messianische Unabhängigkeitsbewegung vom Auftreten Johannes des Täuflers bis zum Untergang Jakobus des Gerechten nach der neuerschlossenen Eroberung von Jerusalem des Flavius Josephus und den christlichen Quellen. Mit Abbildungen einer Auswahl der unveröffentlichten altrussischen Handschriften und anderer Urkunden, einer Erstaussgabe der wichtigsten slavischen Stellen nach Abschriften von ALEXANDER BERENDTS und VASSILYI ISTRIN, sowie den Überresten des rumänischen Josephus übersetzt von MOSES GASTER. Vol. 1. Heidelberg 1929.
- (82) FRANZ BLATT: The Latin Josephus. Vol. 1: Introduction and Text, The Antiquities, Books I–V (*Acta Jutlandica* 30.1, Humanistic Series 44). Aarhus and Copenhagen 1958.
- (83) ROBERT DEVREESE: Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois (Fragments tirés des Chaînes). Città del Vaticano 1959.
- (84) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: Zur Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus' Bericht über die Essener Bell 2, 119–161 bei Hippolyt, Porphyrius, Josippus, Niketas Choniates und anderen. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 77–96.
- (85) ROBERT M. GRANT: Notes on the Text of Theophilus, Ad Autolycum III. In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 12, 1958, pp. 136–144.

- (86) OTTO MICHEL: Zur Arbeit an den Textzeugen des Josephus. In: Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 83, 1971, pp. 101–102.
- (87) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews'. In: Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 4, 1965, pp. 163–188.
- (87a) W. HÖRANDMER, rev.: HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG, Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter. In: Gnomon 47, 1975, pp. 708–710.
- (87b) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus. Leiden 1977.
- (87c) SHLOMO PINES: An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities: Section of Humanities). Jerusalem 1971.
- (87d) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: Le témoignage de Josèphe sur Jésus d'après la tradition indirecte. In: Revue Biblique 80, 1973, pp. 481–513.
- (87e) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt, Ref. IX 18, 2–28, 2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119–161. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism 8, 1977, pp. 1–41.
- (87f) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Flavius Josèphe: Guerre des Juifs, Livre I. Paris 1975.
- (87g) TESSA RAJAK, rev.: ANDRÉ PELLETIER, Flavius Josèphe: Guerre des Juifs, Livre I. In: Classical Review 28, 1978, pp. 20–22.

SCHALIT (77), p. viii, remarks, though not without a touch of exaggeration, that the text of Josephus' 'Antiquities' is more corrupt than any other Greek text. It is in much worse shape than one would gather from NIESE's *editio maior*, though NIESE in his preface says that if he had waited to restore every corruption the edition would have been delayed indefinitely.

SCHRECKENBERG (78) comments that an extensive collation of new manuscripts would increase the massive apparatus of NIESE's *editio maior* only insignificantly, with only a slight chance here and there of localizing the genuine tradition. To be sure, further work on the manuscripts will help to further refine NIESE's stemma, which is extremely complex because Josephus was so widely read and copied.

A possible clue to the unreliability of the text that we possess may be found in the fact that Origen (*Contra Celsum* 1. 47, 2. 13 end; *Commentary on Matthew* 10. 17), Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 2. 13. 20) and Jerome (*De Viris Illustribus* 13) declare that Josephus said that Jerusalem was destroyed because of the murder of James the Just, a statement nowhere to be found in our text of Josephus. Similarly, as PINES (79) has noted, there are statements in the tenth-century Arabic historian Agapius allegedly drawn from Josephus which are not in our texts. These may, of course, be due to interpolations or loose paraphrasing, but they may also refer to a different text.

Inasmuch as Josephus is writing in a language which is still foreign for him, and inasmuch as he appears not to have had assistants for most of the 'Antiquities', as he did for the 'War', we are often reduced to finding what a writer not thoroughly familiar with the language would have written. The corruption in the text of the first half of the 'Antiquities', where he paraphrases the Bible, has been aggravated by the tendency of copyists to assimilate Josephus' text to that of the Septuagint, particularly in the spelling of proper names.

SCHRECKENBERG's study (80) of the transmission of the text of Josephus from the autograph to the *editio princeps* is in preparation for a new edition to replace NIESE. In it he lists, with annotations, the manuscripts of Josephus, as

well as those who cite or quote excerpts from him. Inasmuch as during the Middle Ages Josephus' works were transmitted by Christians who sometimes subjected him to interpolation and censorship, the history of this transmission is of great importance. But SCHRECKENBERG generally does not include those who used Josephus second- or third-hand, since he rejects such Byzantine chronologists as those cited by EISLER (81) as worthless; yet he includes some Byzantine writers who probably knew Josephus only second- or third-hand. Moreover, he has not been exhaustive in citing the Church Fathers and later writers; he mentions but does not recognize, for example, as a citation of the *Testimonium Flavianum* Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus* 13. A spot check of a single passage, *Antiquities* 1. 70–71, indicates that SCHRECKENBERG has omitted references of some merit in John of Antioch and in Joel's 'World-Chronicle', as well as in the *Eklogē Chronikōn* (CRAMER, *Anecdota Paris* 2. 233). SCHRECKENBERG has also omitted the translations and paraphrases of Josephus, which are often more ancient than any of our extant Greek manuscripts. In particular we need a thorough account of the transmission of the Latin version of Josephus, since BLATT's (82) discussion is definitely deficient; for, as SCHRECKENBERG himself admits, the Latin version is frequently most helpful in determining the Greek text. The next edition should also make fuller use of the Greek Epitome than did NIESE.

Inasmuch as the text tradition was apparently polarized into two families as early as the third century, a close study of the testimonia in the Church Fathers should prove rewarding in enabling us to trace the beginnings of this polarization. DEVREESSE (83) notes four passages from the *'Antiquities'* (1. 193, 1. 238, 2. 253, 5. 227) and one from the *'War'* (5. 217) cited in anthologies and in fragmentary works of the Church Fathers, most of which SCHRECKENBERG (80) has omitted and which may be of some value for reconstructing the text.

SCHRECKENBERG (80) asserts that it is most unlikely that a second edition will account for variations in the text transmission. This, we may comment, seems a valid conclusion, since one would expect that in a second edition Josephus would have made more major revisions than mere minor changes of phraseology.

BURCHARD (84) traces the text tradition of the citations by later writers, notably Hippolytus, Porphyry, Josippus, and Niketas Choniates, of the passage concerning the Essenes in *War* 2. 119–161, constructs a stemma showing their relations, and discusses their value for reconstructing the text. He notes that the great majority of the texts go back either to Hippolytus or to Porphyry.

GRANT (85) notes that in *Ad Autolyicum* 3. 20–22 Theophilus follows Manetho and Menander of Ephesus as cited in *Against Apion* 1. 94–103 and 1. 117–126. Such citations, we may remark, may help us greatly in restoring the text of Josephus, especially when they represent unintelligent copying of Josephus, as in Theophilus.

MICHEL (86) has rightly noted the importance of SCHALIT's (87) article discovering a Semitic phrase behind the Greek in *Antiquities* 18. 343; and he suggests, citing *War* 1. 2 and 1. 65 as examples, that this should be extended to the *'War'*. MICHEL is in doubt whether this Semitic influence goes back to an

older transmission or is secondary; but inasmuch as Josephus himself says (War 1. 3) that he originally composed the 'War' in Aramaic, it would be most helpful to retranslate it back into Aramaic in order to get clues as to the original text and to the meaning of the text, just as similar retranslations of the Gospels into Aramaic have sometimes been helpful in understanding the words of Jesus.

HÖRANDMER (87a) notes that SCHRECKENBERG (80) has omitted a number of manuscripts containing short fragments of Josephus.

SCHRECKENBERG (87b) admits that NIESE's stemmata are basically sound but challenges NIESE's undue reliance on one family of manuscripts. He urges full collation of Yale MS. 275 and Bononiensis gr. 3568. He concludes, however, that only through corrections and conjectures will the text be improved materially, and he gives numerous individual instances of such corrections. In general, these conjectures are closer to the manuscripts than are those made by SCHRECKENBERG in 'Theokratia'. We may add, however, that the work of PINES (87c) and DUBARLE (87d) on the 'Testimonium Flavianum' and of BURCHARD (87e) on Josephus' notices concerning the Essenes shows how much can be done for the text of Josephus through a study of the text tradition of those writers who quote or paraphrase Josephus. One major achievement of SCHRECKENBERG is a new insight into the stylistic and linguistic unity of the works of Josephus, and a direct challenge to THACKERAY's theory that Josephus used assistants in composing part of his 'Antiquities'.

PELLETIER (87f) presents a valuable survey of the transmission of Josephus' text, especially by Eusebius. The value of these citations for establishing the text is minor, however, since PELLETIER admits that Eusebius deliberately introduced changes.

RAJAK (87g) protests against what she calls the millenarianism in Josephus studies which has led scholars to hope for a perfect text of Josephus based upon a thorough consideration of every variant reading in all the manuscripts. She disagrees with the protests of some reviewers of NIESE that the text has been tampered with radically and that it is thoroughly corrupt. We may comment that a distinction must be made as to the degrees of corruption in various parts of Josephus. The text of the 'War' is in considerably better shape than that of the 'Antiquities'; and for the 'Antiquities' certain books, notably Book 18, are undoubtedly in worse shape than others.

### 3.2: Studies of Individual Manuscripts and of Early Printed Editions

- (88) HANS OELLACHER: *Griechische Literarische Papyri II*. Baden bei Wien 1939.
- (89) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*. Leiden 1972.
- (90) ALFRED W. POLLARD and GILBERT R. REDGRAVE, ed.: *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475–1640*. London 1926; 2nd ed., 1976.
- (91) HERBERT C. ZAFREN: Printed Rarities in the Hebrew Union College Library. In: *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 5, 1961, pp. 137–156.

- (91a) FRANÇOISE PETIT: *Catena Graeca in Genesim et in Exodum*, vol. 1: *Catena Sinaitica* (*Corpus Christianorum*, series *Graeca*, 2). Brepols-Turnhout 1977.
- (91b) GEORGES-J. WEILL: *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque, Tome I: Manuscrits judaica (non hébraïques)* no. 103 à 522. Paris 1979.

What we would like, of course, would be papyri containing large portions of Josephus; but thus far we have found only one brief fragment, Papyrus Graeca Vindobonensis 29810, dating from the late third century, including War 2. 576–579, 582–594, published by OELLACHER (88) and commented upon by SCHRECKENBERG (89), pp. 54–55. Unfortunately the fragment is in a poor state of preservation, so that I have counted only 38 words in it which are complete and only 74 which are extant in part. The fact, however, that there are nine places (several of them, to be sure, based on somewhat shaky conjectures deriving from the number of letters in a line) where the fragment differs with all the manuscripts collated by NIESE leads us to conclude that the text of the 'War', which is in much better shape than that of the 'Antiquities', is even less secure than we had supposed. None of the changes in the papyrus involve important differences in meaning in the text; but the fact that the papyrus (though it is, of course, dangerous to draw conclusions on the basis of so very short a passage) agrees now with one group of manuscripts (PAM) and now with another (VRC) leads one to suggest, as does SCHRECKENBERG (74), that it is dangerous to rely excessively, as did NIESE, on the PAM group.

POLLARD and REDGRAVE (90) comment on the first edition of Josephus' works in Greek printed in England, which was published in 1590 with a Latin interpretation by JOHN LUIDI at Oxford.

ZAFREN (91), pp. 144–146, cites early editions of Josephus in the Hebrew Union College Library.

PETIT (91a) remarks that the Sinai Manuscript has a number of notes, eight of which are drawn from Josephus through Eusebius of Emesa, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Eusebius of Caesarea.

WEILL (91b), p. 49, 355A, lists *Chroniques tirées de Flavius Josèphe et de Tabari, Histoire des Califes*, from the nineteenth century.

### 3.3: Textual criticism

- (92) IDA MIÉVIS: *Apropos de la correction Thallus dans les Antiquités de Fl. Josèphe*. In: *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 13, 1934, pp. 733–740.
- (93) HORACE A. RIGG, JR.: *Thallus the Samaritan?* In: *Harvard Theological Review* 34, 1941, pp. 111–119.
- (94) GEORGE C. RICHARDS and ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Critical Notes on Josephus' Antiquities*. In: *Classical Quarterly* 31, 1937, pp. 170–177; and 33, 1939, pp. 180–183.
- (95) VINZENZ BULHART: *Josephus*, *Antiq.* ix, 17. In: *Mnemosyne IVa Ser.* 6, 1953, p. 230.
- (96) ANTONIO GARZYA: *Varia Philologica IV*, 2: *Flavio Giuseppe, Autobiogr.* 74. In: *Bolletino del Comitato per la Preparazione dell'Edizione nazionale dei Classici greci e latini* (Supplement to *Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche dell'Accademia dei Lincei*, Roma) 9, 1961, p. 42.
- (97) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, ed. and trans.: *Josephus, Autobiographie*. Paris 1959.

- (98) SVEN LUNDSTRÖM: Josephus, *Contra Apionem* II, 233. In: *Eranos* 51, 1953, pp. 99–100.
- (99) GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE: Emendations to Josephus Flavius' *Contra Apionem*. In: *Classical Quarterly* 12, 1962, p. 108–117.
- (100) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Einige Vermutungen zum Josephustext. In: *Theokratia* 1, 1967–69, pp. 64–75.
- (101) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG, rev.: ROBERT J. H. SHUTT, *Studies in Josephus*. In: *Gnomon* 35, 1963, pp. 28–31.
- (102) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (102a) ANTONIO PIÑERO SÁENZ: Nota crítica a *Antiq. IV 118 de Flavio Josefo*. In: *Emerita* (Madrid) 44, 1976, pp. 121–128.

MIÉVIS (92) corrects ἄλλος (Ant. 18. 167) not to Θάλλος (HUDSON's emendation) but to ἄνθρωπος. But RIGG (93) does well in keeping the manuscript reading ἄλλος, which he has translated as a pronoun, "another."

RICHARDS and SHUTT (94) offer a large number of emendations for the various books of the 'Antiquities' based primarily on the Latin version, which is at least five or six centuries older than our earliest Greek manuscript. If one may judge from the emendations offered for Books 18–20, which I have considered with some care, these suggestions are often far afield and almost never worth adopting.

BULHART (95) reads λήματος for κτήματος (Ant. 9. 17), an emendation that is not really necessary.

GARZYA (96) argues against the preference for manuscript R shown by PELLETIER (97) and attempts to show that this manuscript's reading of χρίσονται in Life 74 is inferior.

LUNDSTRÖM (98) relies on grammatical parallels and on the Latin version in keeping the reading λόγον . . . παραβιασθεῖεν (*Against Apion* 2. 233).

GIANGRANDE (99) offers emendations for *Against Apion* 1. 139, 1. 236, 1. 307, 2. 23, 2. 131, and 2. 215, which generally have palaeographical probability and semantic appropriateness.

SCHRECKENBERG (100) offers 35 emendations: for War 1. 657, 4. 510, 6. 257, 7. 143–144; *Antiquities* 1. 170, 1. 267, 2. 32, 5. 98, 6. 67, 6. 180, 6. 363, 7. 36, 7. 105, 7. 287, 8. 165, 8. 215, 8. 244, 8. 269, 9. 39, 11. 89, 15. 139–140, 15. 333–334, 17. 50, 17. 265, 17. 347, 18. 201, 19. 30, 19. 52, 19. 212, 19. 218, 20. 66–67, 20. 90, 20. 263; Life 153, 208. His suggestions uniformly improve the sense, grammar, and style of Josephus, but all that this proves is that Josephus' Greek is not as good as SCHRECKENBERG's; and, indeed, Josephus' text is full of passages which a good assistant might well improve. But is this the function of an editor? To be sure, SCHRECKENBERG always cites parallels for his emendations; and especially when these are based on the Latin version and on Josephus' usage elsewhere, as SCHRECKENBERG was able to perceive from the concordance being prepared by him and others, they are often attractive. Yet, such an emendation as the correction of ἀναλαβών to λαβών in *Antiquities* 20. 263, proposed originally in SCHRECKENBERG's review (101) of SHUTT, is based upon the fact that ἀναλαβών in the sense of "memorized" is unusual, that the phrase ἐμπειρίαν λαβών is found in Life 10, and that the error could easily occur through



dittography. Yet the use of ἀναλαβών in the sense of “learn by rote” is found in Josephus’ contemporary Plutarch, as well as in Arrian and Alexander Aphrodisiensis in the following two centuries. Of SCHRECKENBERG’s emendations only that on Antiquities 17. 50 (ἀν ἡδίων) is both necessary and palaeographically probable. Antiquities 19. 212 (κατελιγμένος) is transcriptionally probable and definitely improves the sense. The emendation on Antiquities 11. 89 is palaeographically probable, is paralleled, and definitely improves the sense, but it is still not absolutely necessary. Antiquities 7. 287 (ἔλεον) and 8. 244 (εἶδεν) are attractive and satisfactory from a palaeographical point of view but are not really necessary. Antiquities 17. 347 (ἔαρος) is unsatisfactory in sense and not too likely palaeographically. The emendation of Antiquities 20. 90 is ungrammatical. The other passages are generally improved in sense, but the emendations are often not too probable palaeographically.

SCHRECKENBERG (102) comments on textual readings in War 1. 37, 1.174, 1. 365, 1. 378, 2. 303, 2. 486, 3. 290, 3. 341, 3. 400–401, 3. 460, 4. 79, 4. 460, 4. 573, 4. 656, 5. 367, 5. 462, 5. 572, 6.211, 6. 352, 6. 414, 7. 149, and 7. 259. Here, too, SCHRECKENBERG makes good use of the concordance being issued under the editorship of KARL H. RENGSTORF and in which SCHRECKENBERG has played a key role; but, as he himself has noted, there is danger in the use of the concordance, since Josephus wrote over a long period of time and his style changed considerably, particularly, we may add, as he became more familiar with the Greek language, on the one hand, and less dependent upon assistants, on the other. All in all, coming from the man who is likely to be the next editor of the Greek text of Josephus and who certainly has the qualifications for the task, these sample emendations must be termed disappointing. At the foundation of SCHRECKENBERG’s emendations is his adoption of BRUNO SNELL’s principle that the more corrupt a text the more one has the right and indeed the duty, through conjecture, to disregard what violates the rules. But if we had an exhaustive grammar of the Greek language as Josephus knew it and if we noted carefully differences in usage between the ‘War’ and the ‘Antiquities’ we might be more reluctant to emend him.

I have not seen SÁENZ (102a), who has a critical note on Antiquities 4. 118. [See *infra*, p. 900.]

## 4: Translations into Modern Languages

### 4.0: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into English

- (103) WILLIAM WHISTON, trans. Josephus. Complete Works. Philadelphia 1957.
- (104) WILLIAM WHISTON, trans.: Josephus. Complete Works (forward by WILLIAM S. LASOR). Grand Rapids, Mich. 1960.
- (105) WILLIAM WHISTON, trans.: Josephus. Complete Works (introductory essay by H. STEBBING). New York 1961.
- (106) LEWIS BROWNE, ed.: The Wisdom of Israel. New York 1945.
- (107) WILLIAM HERSEY DAVIS and EDWARD A. McDOWELL: A Source Book of Interbiblical History. Nashville 1948.
- (108) SALO W. BARON and JOSEPH L. BLAU, edd.: Judaism: Postbiblical and Talmudic Period. New York 1954.
- (109) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: rev. of SALO W. BARON and JOSEPH L. BLAU, edd., Judaism: Postbiblical and Talmudic Period. In: Classical Weekly 49, 1955–56, pp. 132–134.
- (110) CHARLES K. BARRETT: The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. London 1956; New York 1961, 1966.
- (111) NAHUM N. GLATZER, ed.: The Rest Is Commentary. A Source Book of Judaic Antiquity. Boston 1961. Reprinted as Part I of his The Judaic Tradition. Boston 1969.
- (112) NAHUM N. GLATZER, ed.: Jerusalem and Rome. New York 1960; London 1966.
- (113) ROBERT TRAILL, trans.: The Works of Flavius Josephus, ed. ISAAC TAYLOR. 2 vols. London 1847–51.
- (114) NAHUM N. GLATZER, ed.: The Second Jewish Commonwealth: From the Maccabean Rebellion to the Outbreak of the Judaeo-Roman War. New York 1971.
- (115) WILLIAM R. FARMER, ed.: Flavius Josephus: The Great Roman-Jewish War: A.D. 66–70 (the WILLIAM WHISTON translation as revised by DAVID S. MARGOLIOUTH, including "The Life of Josephus"). New York 1960.
- (116) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 6, Jewish Antiquities, Books IX–XI (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1937.
- (117) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 7, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1943.
- (118) RALPH MARCUS and ALLEN WIKGREN, edd. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 8, Jewish Antiquities, Books XV–XVII (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1963.
- (119) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965.
- (120) MOSES I. FINLEY, ed.: HENRY ST. J. THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS, trans.: Flavius Josephus. The Jewish War and Other Selections. New York 1965.
- (121) ALFRED H. TAMARIN, ed.: Revolt in Judea: The Road to Masada: The eyewitness account by Flavius Josephus of the Roman campaign against Judea, the destruction of the Second Temple, and the heroism of Masada. New York 1968.
- (122) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: ALFRED H. TAMARIN, Revolt in Judea. In: Classical World 64, 1970–71, pp. 29–30.

- (123) HOWARD C. KEE: *The Origins of Christianity. Sources and Documents*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1973.
- (124) MICHAEL A. MEYER, ed.: *Ideas of Jewish History*. New York 1974.
- (125) GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON, trans.: *Josephus: The Jewish War*. Baltimore 1959.
- (126) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON, *Josephus: The Jewish War*. In: *Classical World* 53, 1959–60, pp. 164–165.
- (127) GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: The Destruction of the Jews*. London 1971.
- (128) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.: *Flavius Josephus: Selections from His Works*. New York 1974.
- (129) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Selections from Josephus*. Leiden. In progress.
- (129a) AZRIEL EISENBERG, HANNAH G. GOODMAN, and ALVIN KASS, ed.: *Eyewitnesses to Jewish History from 586 B.C.E. to 1967*. New York 1973. Pp. 45–49: *Josephus Views the Sacking of the Second Temple, 70 C.E.*

For over two hundred years the most widely known translation of Josephus into English or, for that matter, any other language has been that of WILLIAM WHISTON, originally published in 1737. According to SCHRECKENBERG's 'Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus', it has been reprinted or re-edited 132 times. I have found 85 additional reprintings. It was this version that occupied a place on the shelf of literate English-speaking persons between the Jewish Scriptures and the New Testament until it was displaced in this century by the Loeb Classical Library, and in many homes it has lasted until the present day. The translation has undoubted virility, but not only is it based on an inferior text, that of HAVERKAMP (issued in 1726), but it is full of inaccuracies.

A. R. SHILLETO (London 1890) claims to have improved upon WHISTON by correcting errors in scholarship and by simplifying the English style. But this revision must be termed a disappointment, for SHILLETO has kept too much of WHISTON. In his notes, moreover, WHISTON has some strange ideas, notably that Josephus was not only an Ebionite Christian but that he was also bishop of Jerusalem.

DAVID S. MARGOLIOUTH's revision of WHISTON (London 1906) is, like SHILLETO's, unsatisfactory in not revamping WHISTON to a greater degree.

WHISTON's version has been reissued less frequently in recent years because of the supremacy quickly attained by the Loeb version, but it has been reprinted (103) in 1957 (not MARGOLIOUTH's revision, as asserted by SCHRECKENBERG, *Bibliographie*, p. 45, but the original WHISTON); with a foreword, generally favorable to the personality of Josephus, by LASOR (104); and with an old introductory essay by STEBBING (105).

Among selections from Josephus in WHISTON's translation may be noted BROWNE (106), pp. 138–144, an anthology of Jewish literature with three extracts from Josephus (War 1. 372–382 and Against Apion 2. 204–218, 291–295), whom he terms a Roman quisling with a troubled conscience; DAVIS and McDOWELL (107), containing numerous extracts from Josephus in SHILLETO's revision of WHISTON, but with no notes or introductions; BARON and BLAU (108), containing brief selections from Josephus (see my review, 109), available as a paperback; and BARRETT (110), containing selections, especially dealing with Jewish history of the period, with very brief introductions and notes,

a biography of Josephus, and discussions of Josephus on Jesus, Josephus as an apologist, and the Slavonic Josephus.

GLATZER (111) contains (pp. 138–153) selections from *Against Apion* 2. 145–295, and selections from the account of Masada (*War* 7. 341–406) in WHISTON-SHILLETO's edition, with a minimum of very brief notes. In another volume (112) GLATZER presents the general reader with a continuous history of Judaea from 134 B.C.E. to 73 (74) C.E. through a series of brief selections from Josephus' own writings, notably the 'War', with brief introductory comments connecting the passages. While taking TRAILL's (113) translation of the 'War' and WHISTON-SHILLETO's of the 'Antiquities' as his basis, GLATZER has revised them considerably. The result is generally readable (though not quite up to the standard of WILLIAMSON's Penguin version) (125) and usually accurate. GLATZER (114) has also edited a translation of WHISTON as revised by SHILLETO of *Antiquities* 12. 154 to the end of the 'Antiquities', with a select bibliography.

MARGOLIOUTH's revision of WHISTON's translation of the 'War' and of the 'Life' has been published as a Harper Torchbook paperback (New York 1960; rpt. Gloucester, Mass. 1970), with a disappointingly brief and superficial introduction by FARMER (115) on 'Josephus and the Axial Age of History' and another cursory prefatory note on 'Josephus, the Slavonic Fragments, and the Dead Sea Scrolls' by NAHUM N. GLATZER.

The Loeb Library Version in nine volumes bases its text primarily on NIESE, but the editors have frequently exercised independent judgment. MARCUS' volume 6 (116) has an accurate and readable translation, though it lacks somewhat the felicity and vigor of THACKERAY's earlier volumes in the series. MARCUS, however, excels THACKERAY in the fullness of his critical apparatus and of his explanatory notes; he is particularly helpful in citing parallels in rabbinic literature. MARCUS' volume 7 (117) has linguistic and historical notes that are even fuller. Volume 8 (118) appeared after MARCUS' death; it is not up to the standard of volume 7 so far as the accuracy and helpfulness of its commentary is concerned.

My volume 9 (119) also contains a general index to all of Josephus. The following corrigenda should be noted: p. 13, line 10: For townsfolk read masses; p. 172, line 4: For σῆ read σῆ; p. 195, line 1: correct the font of the second quotation mark after "man"; p. 330, line 18: For Μᾶρκος read Μάρκος; p. 330, Apparatus Criticus, note 5: For MW: Μᾶρκον A read M: Μάρκον AWE; p. 371 (marginal summary): "An example of Agrippa's forgiving nature" (in some copies the second, third, and fourth lines of this caption are crooked); p. 386, line 14: For σφαλεῖρον ναι read σφαλερὸν εἶναι; p. 465, line 5: For to whom he read to whom his father; p. 518, Apparatus Criticus, note 3, line 2: For Βαζαφαρμάνης Phot. p. 318 read Βαζαφαρμάνης Phot. p. 318; p. 560, line 2: For philosophers read philosophies; p. 562, line 27: After pp. 268–322. add 1925; p. 586, line 3: For Proselytizing read Proselyting; p. 618, column 1, lines 9–10: For xiv. 41, 91; xx. 234 read xiv. 91; xx. 251; p. 621, col. 1, line 14: After xiv. 389 add; Herod's sons Alexander and Aristobulus stay at his home, xv. 343; p. 624, col. 1, line 47: after xviii. 32–33; add: sends Thesmusas to Phraates as a gift, xviii. 40; p. 634, col. 2, lines 17–18: after xvi. 162; omit: sends Thesmusas to Phraates as a gift, viii. 40; p. 650, col. 2, line 27: For 305, 311 read 305; inquires

of G-d concerning the war, vii. 311; p. 655, col. 1, line 19: For Egypt ns read Egyptians; p. 656, col. 2, line 3: Omit 169; p. 656, col. 2, line 4: For 171 read 169; p. 662, col. 1, line 42: For 373 read 373–378; p. 690, col. 2, line 3: Omit parentheses after Herodium; p. 693, col. 2, line 49: For Antipater read Antigonus; p. 698, col. 1, line 13: For Phiabi read Phabi; p. 710, col. 1, line 12: Jesus (14): Add: perhaps to be identified with Jesus (11); p. 712, col. 2, line 48: For ii. 285 read ii. 585; p. 718, col. 1, line 6: For 422 read 423; p. 728, col. 1, line 45: After iv. 205 add: assist magistracies, iv. 214; p. 737, col. 1, lines 33–34: For 283–287 read 283–287; records (i. e. omit Menander [2] of Ephesus and run that entry together with Menander [1], who is identical); p. 753, col. 2, line 41: The entry Pentephres should be divided into two entries thus: Pentephres (1) (var. Petephres; Bibl. Potiphar), an Egyptian, A. ii. 39, 49; Joseph falsely accused before him by his wife, ii. 54–58; ii. 78. Pentephres (2) (Bibl. Poti-phaera), priest of Heliopolis, ii. 91; p. 761, col. 2, line 29: For presumably read presumably; p. 762, col. 1, line 29: For xiv. 29 read A. xiv. 29; p. 762, col. 1, line 33: For xiv. 38–39, 46–47 read xiv. 41–46; p. 762, col. 2, line 27: For 61 read 64; p. 784, col. 1, line 2: For A. xx. 122 read A. xix. 365; xx. 122, 176; p. 786, col. 2, line 2: For Aristeus read Aristeas; p. 790, col. 2, line 4: For [2] read [3]; p. 795, col. 2, line 35: For [13] read [14]; p. 812, col. 1, line 17: For ii. 651 read ii. 444, 564, 651.

Among selections from the Loeb translation we may note FINLEY (120), who has edited and abridged and provided an introduction to the 'Jewish War', as well as other selections. TAMARIN (121) (see my review) (122) has abridged, with some rewriting, THACKERAY's version of the 'War'; but there is no indication as to what has been omitted or rewritten. He shows no awareness of the controversies as to whether Josephus' account may be trusted and as to whether Masada's defenders were heroes or cowards. TAMARIN has, moreover, introduced some errors into the translation which are not found in his source, THACKERAY. He apparently did not consult the original Greek in compiling the work. He errs also in asserting that the Roman soldier who tore the Torah was handed over to the Jews, whereas actually he was beheaded by Cumanus (Ant. 20. 117). The book is lavishly illustrated.

KEE's (123) collection of texts includes passages from the 'Antiquities' and the 'War' in the Loeb version, with brief introductions and comments. MEYER (124), pp. 52–63, includes selections in the Loeb translation from the prefaces to the 'War' (1. 1–30) and the 'Antiquities' (1. 1–25) with very brief introductions and notes.

The translation by WILLIAMSON (125) is especially commendable for its simple, contemporary idiom. It makes Josephus more readable by relegating his digressions to footnotes or appendices (see my review) (126). A new hardback edition of WILLIAMSON's translation (127) has now appeared with beautiful and striking engravings by GARRICK PALMER but omitting the history of the Jews from Antiochus Epiphanes to Archelaus.

WASSERSTEIN (128) has edited a judiciously chosen group of selections in WHISTON's translation but revised by himself in many places, together with a fine introduction and brief but helpful notes. He has preferred selections illus-

trating the political, religious, and cultural history of the Jews to those dealing with military or topographical details.

SHUTT (129) has informed me by letter that he has compiled a volume of selections from Josephus, with introductions to each of Josephus' works and a fresh translation and notes as necessary, which is to be published by Brill.

EISENBERG, GOODMAN, and KASS (129a) present WHISTON's translation of selections from Josephus' account of the destruction of the Temple (War 6. 249ff.), together with a brief introduction on Josephus's life and works. Their conclusion is that Josephus' history does not meet modern scientific standards but that he was a learned man.

#### 4.1: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into French

- (130) ARNAULD D'ANDILLY, trans.: Flavius Josèphe. Histoire ancienne des Juifs et La guerre des Juifs contre les Romains, 66–70 après J.-C. Autobiographie. Textes . . . adaptés en français moderne par J. A. C. BUCHON. Preface de VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY. Paris 1968.
- (131) THÉODORE REINACH, ed.: Oeuvres complètes de Flavius Josèphe. 7 vols. Paris 1900–32.
- (132) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, trans.: Flavius Josèphe: Autobiographie (Collection des Universités de France, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Paris 1959.
- (133) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, trans.: Flavius Josèphe: Guerre des Juifs, I: Livre I (Collection des Universités de France, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Paris 1975. II: Livres II et III. Paris 1980.
- (133a) PIERRE SAVINEL, trans.: Flavius Josèphe. La guerre des juifs. Précédé de Du bon usage de la trahison by PIERRE VIDAL-NAQUET. Paris 1977.

What WHISTON has been to the English-speaking world D'ANDILLY has been to the French, though he has hardly gone through as many editions. The most recent edition, adapted into modern French, is by BUCHON (130) with a brief preface by NIKIPROWETZKY. BUCHON's revision, made in 1836, does not take into account the advances of the nineteenth century in arriving at Josephus' text.

The excellent translation into French edited under the direction of THÉODORE REINACH (131) is often drawn upon by THACKERAY in his Loeb volumes for the rabbinic learning which its notes contain, though MARCUS considerably surpasses it in this respect. It is complete except for the 'Life', a lack which has just been remedied by ANDRÉ PELLETIER's translation (132) in the Budé series, containing the Greek text (marred by a number of misprints) and a translation (containing a number of errors), introduction (containing nothing novel) and notes (largely dependent upon THACKERAY's Loeb edition). PELLETIER (133) is preparing a text and another translation of the 'War', of which Books 1–3 have appeared. His translation is adequate but hardly distinguished. He continues to be largely dependent upon THACKERAY's Loeb edition for his notes. His notes and excursus disregard many significant scholarly works.

I have not seen SAVINEL (133a). [See *infra*, p. 900.]

## 4.2: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into German

- (134) HEINRICH CLEMENTZ, trans.: Des Flavius Josephus Jüdische Altertümer. 2 vols. Halle 1899; rpt. Köln 1959.
- (135) HEINRICH CLEMENTZ, trans.: Flavius Josephus, Geschichte des Jüdischen Krieges. Halle 1900; rpt. Köln 1959, Wiesbaden 1977.
- (136) HEINRICH CLEMENTZ, trans.: Des Flavius Josephus kleinere Schriften (Selbstbiographie – Gegen Apion – Über die Makkabäer). Halle 1900; rpt. Köln 1960.
- (137) HEINRICH CLEMENTZ, trans. and HEINZ KREISSIG, introduction and notes: Flavius Josephus, Geschichte des Jüdischen Krieges. Leipzig 1970, 1974.
- (138) OTTO MICHEL and OTTO BAUERNFEIND, trans.: Flavius Josephus. De bello judaico. Der jüdische Krieg. Griechisch und Deutsch. vol. 1 (books 1–3) Bad Homburg, Darmstadt 1959; 2nd ed., 1962; vol. 2.1 (books 4–5) München, Darmstadt 1963; vol. 2.2 (books 6–7) Darmstadt 1969; vol. 3 (with T. HIRSCH) (Ergänzungen und Register) München 1969.
- (139) HERMANN ENDRÖS, trans.: Flavius Josephus. Der jüdische Krieg. De Bello Judaico. 2 vols. München 1965–66, 1974.
- (140) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Commentary on *Antiquities* (in progress).
- (141) BENJAMIN MURMELSTEIN, ed.: Flavius Josephus. Lebenslauf, Jüdische Altertümer, Geschichte des Jüdischen Krieges, Widerlegung des Apion von Alexandrien. Wien 1938.
- (142) KURT GALLING, ELMAR EDEL, RIEKELE BORGER: Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels. Tübingen 1950; 2nd ed., 1968.
- (143) CHARLES K. BARRETT: Die Umwelt des Neuen Testaments. Ausgewählte Quellen (Trans. by CARSTEN COLPE of: The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. London 1956). (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 4). Tübingen 1959.
- (144) JOHANNES LEIPOLDT and WALTER GRUNDMANN, ed.: Umwelt des Urchristentums, II: Texte zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Berlin 1967.
- (145) HERMANN ENDRÖS, ed.: Der jüdische Krieg (De bello judaico, Teilaußg. dt.). Auswahl. (Goldmanns gelbe Taschenbücher, Bd. 2481). München 1969.

CLEMENTZ' translations (134) (135) (136), which have been reprinted without change, are far below the scholarly standard of the Loeb edition in English or the REINACH edition in French and have very inadequate notes. A more recent re-issue of CLEMENTZ (137) has an introduction and notes by KREISSIG.

MICHEL and BAUERNFEIND (138) have issued, in three volumes, the Greek text (based on NIESE) of the 'War' with a competent German translation on opposite pages. The apparatus criticus and notes are somewhat briefer, particularly for the first books (usually containing only cross-references), than those of the Loeb edition, but the notes are of particular interest because they avail themselves so greatly of the Dead Sea Scrolls. There are, moreover, twenty-five excursus, averaging two pages in length, on the following individual points of the text, particularly in Books 6 and 7: Acra (Book 1. 39, 50); the Herodian buildings in Jericho (Book 1, *passim*); the eagle on the Temple in Jerusalem (1. 648–655); transgression of law by the Zealots (παράνομία) (4. 154); the "Zealots" in Josephus, War 4 (4. 161); the "Idumaeans" in Josephus, War 4 (4. 224); Simon bar Giora (4. 512); the site of Jerusalem (5. 136ff.); the citadel of Herod (5. 181); the citadel of Antonia (5. 247); the bronze shekel of the "Year 4 of the Redemption" (5. 555); the teaching of Josephus concerning the soul (6. 48); the East Gate of the inner Temple precinct (6. 292); the significance

of the "sign" of Josephus (6. 299); the χρησιμὸς ἀμφίβολος and its significance (6. 312); the special legal situation of the Jews (6. 335); the population of Jerusalem without pilgrims and strangers (6. 386); the idea of τύχη in Josephus (6. 413); Jerusalem after the destruction of 70 C.E. (7. 20); the description of the triumphal procession according to Josephus (7. 130); the problem of the Sicarii and the relationship of the revolutionary groups to one another (7. 253); the analysis of the Masada episode, War 7. 252–406 (7. 271); the archaeological discoveries in their relationship to the report of Josephus on the Roman siege of Masada (7. 277); the speeches of Eleazar (7. 321); and the geographical determination of the Temple district of Leontopolis (7. 422).

Volume 2.1 contains a supplementary bibliography (including many irrelevant items and omitting many significant ones) which lists a number of works in Hebrew which were influential in establishing the Greek text. The third volume, in addition to several pages of supplementary bibliography and remarks about research on Josephus during the last few years, contains about 150 pages of four valuable indices, particularly to the notes, on persons and things, Greek ideas, places, and citations.

ENDRÖS' (139) version of the 'War' contains a brief general introduction but no notes.

SCHALIT (140), whose commentary in Hebrew on the first ten books of the 'Antiquities' is a fine contribution, had been working for many years prior to his recent death on an exhaustive commentary in German on Books 11–20 (the portions which the present author has seen are of very high quality), to be followed by a much expanded version in German of his Hebrew commentary on the first half of the work.

MURMELSTEIN (141) has compiled, in popular format, a volume of unannotated selections from Josephus' works, taken from six different translations.

GALLING-EDEL-BORGER (142) is a source-book containing the Greek text and notes on Antiquities 11. 302–303, 306, 309–311, 340, 342–344; 12. 138–139, 143–144, 140–142, and 258–264.

The German version of BARRETT (143) is by COLPE and is marked by very brief introductions and very few notes on War 2. 184–187, 192–203; Antiquities 18. 66–80, as well as other passages dealing with the Jewish history of this period.

LEIPOLDT and GRUNDMANN (144) is a beautiful edition of the sources, containing an anthology illustrating the history of the Jews taken largely from Josephus.

ENDRÖS (145) has a generous selection from his own translation.

#### 4.3: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Hebrew

(146) JACOB N. H. SIMCHONI (SIMCHOWITZ), trans.: Works of Josephus (in Hebrew), 4 vols. Warsaw–Berlin 1923–1930; rpt. Tel-Aviv, 1925–1938, 1955, 1959, 1961, 1970.

(147) ALEXANDER SCHORR, trans.: Antiquitates Judaicae (in Hebrew), 2 vols. Jerusalem 1940–1945.



- (148) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, trans.: Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* (in Hebrew). 3 vols. Jerusalem 1944–63.
- (149) SHMUEL HAGGAI, trans.: Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1964: 2nd ed., 1967.
- (150) JACOB N. H. SIMCHONI (SIMCHOWITZ), trans.: *The Army of Jerusalem* (in Hebrew). ("An Hour's Reading from the Hebrew Literature," 5). Tel-Aviv 1943.
- (151) EMANUEL BIN GORION (BERDICHEVSKY), trans.: *Herod and His House* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1946.
- (152) MENAHEM STERN, ed.: *The Documents on the Revolt of the Hasmoneans* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1965.
- (153) EPHRAIM TALMI, ed.: *The Book of Galilee* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1965.
- (154) HANS LEWY: *New Paths in the Investigation of Jewish Hellenism* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 10, 1945, pp. 197–204.
- (154a) URIEL RAPPAPORT: *Josephus Flavius: A Help Manual for Class* (in Hebrew). Haifa, Haifa University, 1971.
- (154b) DAVID AMIT, ed.: *Fortresses of the Desert in the Days of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew), 2nd ed., prepared for an assembly on Fortresses and Water Facilities in the Desert. Kefar Etzion 1976.

The translation into Hebrew by SIMCHONI (146), containing the 'War', 'Against Apion', and the 'Life' (the last by MENAHEM [EDMUND] STEIN), is full of inaccuracies and is stylistically far from Josephus.

SCHORR's (147) 'Antiquities' remains incomplete; volume 1 contains Books 1–4, and volume 2 contains Books 5–8. It sometimes contains in its notes helpful rabbinic parallels. It is superseded by SCHALIT's translation (148), of which the first two volumes contain the translation of and notes on Books 1–10, and the third the translation of Books 11–20. The commentary on these last books will eventually appear in German. SCHALIT is especially praiseworthy for his fidelity to the meaning of Josephus and for his excellent notes.

HAGGAI's (149) translation of the 'War' is into a Hebrew more modern than that of SIMCHONI, particularly in its military terminology. It has a very brief introduction and very skimpy notes.

A thirty-two-page pamphlet containing a portion of SIMCHONI's (150) translation dealing with the Jewish army has been issued separately.

BIN GORION (151) contains selections in Hebrew from Book 1 of the 'War' and Book 14 of the 'Antiquities', popularly presented with few notes.

STERN (152) provides a Hebrew translation and brief but helpful notes for the following selections: *Antiquities* 12. 138–144, 145–146, 258–264; 13. 260–265; 14. 145–148, 233, and 247–255.

TALMI (153) has edited an anthology of brief, unannotated descriptions, stories, and poems dealing with Galilee. Included are many very short selections from Josephus.

LEWY (154), commenting on the first volume of SCHALIT's (148) translation of the 'Antiquities' into Hebrew, avers that in accuracy and precision SCHALIT's version is superior even to THACKERAY's. In particular, he praises the portion of the introduction dealing with the relationship of Josephus with the Greek historiography of Thucydides and of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He expresses the hope that the 'War' will find a Hebrew translator on a level with

SCHALIT (a hope not yet realized), since SIMCHONI's (146) is full of errors and is done in a style unsuitable to the original.

RAPPAPORT (154a) has some selections from Josephus and from related literature in Hebrew translation for a course in Josephus.

AMIT (154b) contains selections, without commentary, from the sources, mostly Josephus, and maps concerning fortifications at Alexandrion, the Jericho area, Hyrcania, Herodium, Machaerus, and Masada. He uses SIMCHONI's translation for the 'War' and SCHALIT's for the 'Antiquities'.

#### 4.4: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Italian

- (155) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI, trans.: Flavio Giuseppe tradotto e commentato. 4 vols. Turin 1937–1939, 1949, 1963.
- (156) ANGELO SCARPELLINI: Flavio Giuseppe tradotto e annotato. In: *Convivium* 10, 1938, pp. 692–697.
- (156a) GIOVANNI VITUCCI, trans.: La guerra giudaica / Flavio Giuseppe; con un'appendice sulla traduzione in russo antico a cura di NATALINO RADOVICH. 2 vols. Milan 1974.
- (156b) LUCIO TROIANI: Commento storico al 'Contro Apione' di Giuseppe. Introduzione, Commento Storico, Traduzione e Indici (Biblioteca degli studi classici e orientali, 9). Pisa 1977.

RICCIOTTI's (155) fine translation of the 'Jewish War' into Italian devotes a full volume to a biography in black hues of Josephus and to a discussion of his works. The translation itself is accurate and lucid, and the notes are full. For an appreciation see SCARPELLINI (156).

VITUCCI (156a) has a critical edition of the Greek text, translation into Italian, and brief commentary of the 'War', together with a short introduction. There is an appendix by RADOVICH on the Slavonic version.

TROIANI (156b) has translated 'Against Apion' into Italian and has an extensive introduction concerning, in particular, the dates of traditions mentioned in the work, an historical commentary, and some textcritical notes.

#### 4.5: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Spanish

- (157) JUAN A. G. LARRAYA, trans.: Las guerras de los judios. Barcelona 1952.
- (158) JOSÉ (GIUSEPPE) RICCIOTTI, trans.: Flavio Josefo traducido y comentado. La guerra giudaica. 3 vols. Barcelona 1960, 1969.
- (159) LUIS FARRÉ, trans.: Obras completas de Flavio Josefo. 5 vols. (Coleccion Valores en el tiempo, 26–30). Buenos Aires 1961.
- (160) FRANCISCO DE P. SAMARANCH, trans.: Josephus, Contra Apión. Madrid 1966.
- (161) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Dos Opúsculos Inéditos. In: *Davar* (Buenos Aires) no. 99, Oct.–Dec. 1963, pp. 70–77.

LARRAYA (157) has translated the 'War' into Spanish.

RICCIOTTI's translation of the 'War' into Italian (155) has been rendered into Spanish (158): this includes RICCIOTTI's long introduction on the life and works of Josephus, especially on the 'Testimonium Flavianum'.

FARRÉ (159) has translated the complete works of Josephus, including IV Maccabees; his notes are very few and brief.

SAMARANCH (160) has rendered 'Against Apion'.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (161) contains a translation into Spanish of Josephus' account of Alexander the Great in Jerusalem (Ant. 11. 317–339), together with a very brief, fragmentary introduction to Josephus generally rather than a commentary on this particular passage.

#### 4.6: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Other Languages: Arabic, Czech, Dutch, Modern Greek, Hungarian, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serbian

- (162) YOCEP B. D. RENASSIA, trans.: *Sefer Istvar Delihud*. Djerba, Tunisia, 1956.
- (163) JAROSLAV HAVELKA and JAROSLAV ŠONKA, trans.: *Josephus Flavius: Válka židovská z řečtiny přeložil* (introduction by STANISLAV SEGERT). Praha 1965.
- (164) MARTINUS A. BEEK, trans.: *De val van Jeruzalem* (Meulenhoff Pockets). Amsterdam 1958.
- (165) MARTINUS A. BEEK, trans.: *Flavius Josefus: Het Leven van Herodes* (Meulenhoff Pockets, 32). Amsterdam 1959.
- (166) VASILIOS M. VELLAS, trans.: *Φλαβίου Ἰωσήπου κατ' Ἀπίωνος, Λόγος Α' καὶ Λόγος Β'.* Athens 1938–1939.
- (167) JÓZSEF RÉVAY, trans.: *Josephus Flavius. A zsidók története* (= The Jewish History). Budapest 1946.
- (168) JÓZSEF RÉVAY, trans.: *Flavius Josephus. A zsidók története* (= The Jewish History). Books 11–12 (notes and preface by ISTVAN HAHN). Bratislava 1966.
- (169) JÓZSEF RÉVAY, trans.: *Josephus Flavius. A zsidó háború. Függelékül: Flavius Josephus önéletrajza* (= The Jewish War; supplemented by Flavius Josephus' Biography). Budapest 1963.
- (170) IWAMOTO SHŪICHI, trans.: *F. Josephus ni yoru Yudayajin no rekishi* (= Jerusalem and Rome). Tokyo 1971.
- (170a) MASASHI TAKAHASHI: *Book of Ezra and Book of Nehemiah* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1951.
- (170b) HIROSHI SHINMI, trans.: *The Jewish War* (in Japanese). Vols. 1 and 2. Tokyo 1975, 1981.
- (170c) TOSHIO HIRANUMA, KINJI HIDEMURA, et al., edd.: *Sources for Intertestamental and New Testament Periods* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1976.
- (170d) GOHEI HATA, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: Contra Apionem* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1977.
- (170e) GOHEI HATA, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: Vita* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1978.
- (170f) GOHEI HATA, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: Antiquitates Judaicae, Books 12–13* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1979.
- (170g) GOHEI HATA, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: Antiquitates Judaicae, Books 14–15* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1980.
- (171) STANISLAW LENKOWSKI, trans.: *Josephus. Przeciw Apionowi* (= Against Apion). Lwów 1937.
- (172) ZYGMUNT KUBIAK and JAN RADOZYCKI, trans.: *Józef Flawiusz. Dawne dzieje Izraela. Antiquitates Judaicae* (introduction by EUGENIUSZ DABROWSKI; essay on Josephus in Polish by W. MALEJ). Poznań 1962.

- (173) VINCENTE PEDROSO, trans.: Flávio Josefo, *História dos Hebreus*. 9 vols. São Paulo, Brazil, 1956.
- (174) A. J. MALEINA, trans.: *Antiquitates Judaicae, Bellum Judaicum, Contra Apionem* (selections, in Russian). In: *Scythica et Caucasica* 1, 1947 (?), pp. 482–485 (cited by SCHRECKENBERG, *Bibliographie*, p. 243, who refers to *Vestnik Drevnej Istorij*, 1947, no. 4, pp. 275–277.
- (175) DUSÁN GLUMAC, trans.: *Josephus Flavius: Judejski Rat* (= *Bellum Judaicum*). Beograd 1967.

RENASSIA (162) contains portions of the 'War' translated from Hebrew into Arabic and written in Hebrew letters.

HAVELKA and SONKA (163) have an annotated translation of the 'War' into Czech with a twenty-five-page introduction by SEGERT.

In Dutch BEEK (164) has issued a selection from the 'War' on the fall of Jerusalem, as well as (165) excerpts from the 'Antiquities', Books 14–17, on the life of Herod.

VELLAS (166) contains a translation into modern Greek, with an introduction examining the source, date, and value, of 'Contra Apionem', together with a bibliography.

RÉVAY (167) has translated the 'Antiquities' into Hungarian but without notes. Books 11 and 12 of the translation (168) have been published separately with a preface and notes by HAHN. RÉVAY (169) has translated the 'War' and the 'Vita' with a very brief introduction and extremely few and brief notes.

Since the end of the Second World War the Japanese have evinced considerable interest in Judaism. One result of this has been SHÛICHI's (170) translation of GLATZER's 'Jerusalem and Rome' containing a history of Judaea from 134 B.C.E. to 73 (74) C.E. in Josephus' own words.

TAKAHASHI (170a), pp. 451–492, has a translation into Japanese of 'Antiquities', Book 11.

SHINMI (170b) has issued the first two of a projected three volumes containing the translation of the 'War'. With the death of SHINMI in 1979, the third volume is to be published by GOHEI HATA in 1982.

HIRANUMA, HIDEMURA, et al. (170c) have a sourcebook based on BARRETT (110), which includes numerous selections from Josephus' works.

HATA (170d) (170e) (170f) (170g) has issued a translation, with introduction and commentary, of 'Against Apion', the 'Life' and Books 12 through 15 of the 'Antiquities'; his future plans are to complete the translation of the 'Antiquities' into Japanese.

ŁĘNKOWSKI (171) has translated 'Against Apion' into Polish. KUBIAK and RADOZYCKI (172) have given us the first translation of the 'Antiquities' directly from Greek into Polish, basing themselves primarily on NIESE's Greek text, with an extensive and learned introduction on the life, works, and manuscript tradition of Josephus and on translations from Latin into Polish by DABROWSKI, with an essay on the transmission of the manuscripts, and on editions, translations, and scholarship pertaining to Josephus in Poland by MALEJ, a list (with brief discussion) by RADOZYCKI of post-Biblical authors cited in the 'Antiquities', and with an extensive bibliography (particularly of works in Polish)

by DABROWSKI. There are few notes except on the 'Testimonium Flavianum' and the Slavonic Josephus, and on Josephus' reference to James the brother of Jesus; these remarks are supplied with lengthy bibliographies.

PEDROSO (173) has translated the 'Antiquities' into Portuguese.

MALEINA (174) has the Greek text and translation into Russian of selections from the 'Antiquities', 'War', and 'Against Apion'.

GLUMAC (175) has translated the Latin version of the 'War' into Serbian.

## 5: The Latin and Syriac Versions

### 5.0: The Latin Versions: Introduction

There are two translations of Josephus into Latin: the first is a free reworking of the fourth century attributed to a certain Hegesippus (Egesippus), who claims to be writing an original work in accordance with the spirit of Christianity; the other is the famous translation made under the direction of Cassiodorus in the sixth century.

### 5.1: The Name Hegesippus

(176) VINCENTIUS USSANI, ed.: *Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V* (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. 66). Vol. 1 (Wien, Leipzig 1932); vol. 2 (with preface by Carolus Mras; Wien 1960).

Considerable confusion has arisen because the name Hegesippus was not used prior to the ninth century, so that when the work is referred to, for example, by Eucharius in the fifth century, Ambrosianus in the seventh century, and Cassellan in the ninth century, the author is called Josephus. Most scholars regard the name Hegesippus as a corruption of Josephus, but it was NIESE's theory that the name arose from an otherwise unknown Christian, Josippus.

USSANI (176) proposes that the name came about because of a confusion with the original Hegesippus, an ecclesiastical historian known to us by citations from his five books of 'Hypomnemata' in Eusebius' 'Historia Ecclesiastica'. Hence some scholars refer to our text as pseudo-Hegesippus. But, we may ask, if USSANI is right, why was the name Hegesippus not attached to our work until seven centuries after the original Hegesippus? The name would seem to be due to the same type of confusion with that of Josephus as occasioned the Hebrew Josippon (Josephon).

### 5.2: The Text of Hegesippus

(177) VINCENTIUS USSANI, ed.: *Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V* (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. 66), Vol. 1 (Wien, Leipzig 1932); vol. 2 (with preface by CAROLUS MRAS; Wien 1960).

(178) VINZENZ BULHART: *Textkritisches und Exegetisches zum Hegesippus*. In: *Mnemosyne* 6, 1953, pp. 314–317.

Because the text of Hegesippus circulated in so many widely differing recensions, it presents the student with a problem not unlike that confronting the student of the Septuagint, who wonders whether there ever was an Ur-Septuagint and, if so, whether it can be reconstructed. To a lesser degree the same kind of problem confronts the student of Josippon (Josephon).

USSANI (177) has, in Part 1, a critical edition of the text and, in Part 2, a preface by MRAS on the manuscripts, the title, and the author, as well as indices by USSANI. The edition has been subjected to criticism by BULHART (178).

### 5.3: Authorship of Hegesippus

- (179) JOSEPH WITTIG: Der Ambrosiaster Hilarius: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Papstes Damasus I. In: Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie (= Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen) 4, 1906, pp. 1–66.
- (180) OTTO SCHOLZ: Die Hegesippus-Ambrosius-Frage. Eine literarhistorische Besprechung. In: Ambrosiaster-Studien (= Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen) 8, 1909, pp. 149–195. (Diss., Univ. of Breslau [Königshütte] 1913).
- (181) ADOLF LUMPE: Zum Hegesipp-Problem. In: Byzantinische Forschungen 3, 1968, pp. 165–167 (= Lemmata: Festschrift Widu Wolfgang Ehlers. München 1968. Pp. 171–173).
- (182) VINCENTIUS USSANI, ed.: Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. 66). Vol. 1 (Wien, Leipzig 1932); vol. 2 (with preface by CAROLUS MRAS; Wien 1960).
- (183) J. GRUBER, rev.: VINCENTIUS USSANI, ed., Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V. In: Gnomon 34, 1962, pp. 685–686.
- (184) KARL MRAS: Drei seltsame Stellen bei Iosippus (fälschlich Hegesippus), De bello Iudaico. In: Wiener Studien 74, 1961, pp. 138–141.
- (184a) ALBERT A. BELL, JR.: An Historiographical Analysis of the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* of Pseudo-Hegesippus. Diss., Ph. D., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill 1977.

One of scholarship's favorite indoor sports, especially at the turn of the century, had been to guess the identity of the author of Hegesippus. Some had argued that the author was the Ambrosiaster (pseudo-Ambrose, the unknown author of the commentary on the epistles of St. Paul) in Milan and had suggested a date in the second half of the fourth century.

WITTIG (179) had attempted to identify the author with Isaac of Judaea, portions of whose works on faith are still extant; and SCHOLZ (180) had similarly disputed the ascription to Ambrose.

LUMPE (181) revives the theory, on the basis of linguistic and stylistic similarities, that the author was Ambrose.

The way to resolve such a dispute, it would seem, is through close study and analysis of vocabulary, grammar, and style of the work as compared with other work of the same general period of similar content. MRAS, in the preface to USSANI (182), concludes that the style forces us to discard both Ambrose and the Ambrosiaster as the author; as for Isaac, the evidence is not decisive, since, as we may note, the works are not similar in subject matter.

GRUBER (183) has demonstrated the weakness of MRAS' (182) arguments. MRAS (184) has noted that the grammar of three passages in Hegesippus (2. 22,

2. 36. 2, 1. 41. 9) is definitely not consonant with that employed by Ambrose, and that they are, in fact, unparalleled in their Latinity. But until we have concordances of both Hegesippus and of other writers of the time, the matter must remain *sub iudice*.

BELL (184a) concludes that Hegesippus was probably a native of Antioch and was not Ambrose.

#### 5.4: The Content of Hegesippus and Its Relation to Josippon

- (185) ESTHER SORSCHER: A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hegesippus, and the Yosippon. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (186) YITZHAK BAER: The Book of Josephon the Hebrew (in Hebrew). In: Sefer Dinaburg. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 178–205.
- (186a) ALBERT A. BELL, JR.: An Historiographical Analysis of the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* of Pseudo-Hegesippus. Diss., Ph.D., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill 1977.

In the great concern with establishing the authorship of Hegesippus, scholars have done little in investigation of the content itself of the work. The only systematic study is by SORSCHER (185), a fine first attempt, but clearly far from exhaustive even for the single Book 3 to which she restricts herself. Josippon's dependence on Hegesippus is clear from the fact, noted by SORSCHER, that he never includes anything omitted by Hegesippus, whereas he omits much that Hegesippus had taken from Josephus. Hegesippus' text portrays the Roman army as *sanctissimi commilitiones*, a veritable precursor of the church militant. SORSCHER's conclusion is that whereas Josephus' purpose is political, namely, to glorify Rome and to discourage rebellion, Hegesippus' is religious, to prove that the war was a divine punishment inflicted upon the Jews, while Josippon's is also religious but attempts to counter Hegesippus' negative attitude toward the Jews; he would have included, suggests SORSCHER, all references in the 'War' that praise the Jews had he seen it, but the fact that he did not include such passages proves that he had not seen it. Since Josephus himself played a more important role in the events recounted in Book 3 than in any other book of the 'War', his account is probably more biased than it is elsewhere, and hence it would have been preferable if SORSCHER had selected another book for the sample study. Moreover, there are many passages in Josephus himself that argue that the war is proof of divine punishment inflicted upon the Jews, a motif that SORSCHER ascribes to Hegesippus.

A close study of parallel texts in Hegesippus and Josippon would also help to establish the dates of these works. Thus BAER (186) shows that Agrippa's speech on rebellion in Hegesippus contains a fourth-century picture of the geography of the world, whereas in Josippon we have a reflection of tenth-century realities.

BELL (186a) contends that Pseudo-Hegesippus writes in the classical historiographical mould and was indeed the first Christian to attempt to do so. He compares his dependence on Josephus with Livy's on Polybius; but, we may comment,



Hegesippus' debt to Josephus is far greater, though, admittedly, he rewrites all of the speeches in Josephus and sometimes has versions eight or nine times as long as those in Josephus. Hegesippus, he notes, includes Christian material and, indeed, consulted sources other than Josephus, such as I Maccabees, Lucan, Suetonius, Tacitus, and probably Livy. Hence Hegesippus should be rehabilitated as a historian in his own right, who did not succumb to mere Christian apologetics.

### 5.5: The Text of the Latin Version Made under Cassiodorus' Direction

- (187) GIULANO USSANI: Studi preparatori ad una edizione della traduzione latina in sette libre del 'Bellum Judaicum'. Roma 1944. (= Bolletino del Comitato per la Preparazione dell' Edizione nazionale dei Classici greci e latini N.S. 1, 1945, pp. 86–102).
- (188) FRANZ BLATT: Recherches sur l'établissement du texte et l'histoire de la tradition du Josèphe latin: In: *Revue des Études Latines* 26, 1948, pp. 31–32.
- (189) FRANZ BLATT, ed.: *The Latin Josephus, I: Introduction and Text, The Antiquities, Books I–V* (Acta Jutlandica 30. 1, Hum. Ser. 44). Aarhus and Copenhagen 1958.
- (190) JAMES A. WILLIS, rev.: FRANZ BLATT, *The Latin Josephus, I*. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 51, 1961, pp. 272–273.
- (191) DAVID FLUSSER, rev.: FRANZ BLATT, *The Latin Josephus, I*. In: *Kirjath Sefer* 34, 1958–59, pp. 458–463.
- (192) SVEN LUNDSTRÖM, rev.: FRANZ BLATT, *The Latin Josephus, I*. In: *Gnomon* 31, 1959, pp. 619–624.
- (192a) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden 1977.
- (193) FRANZ BLATT, ed.: *The Latin Josephus, II: The Antiquities, Books VI–X*. Awaiting publication.
- (194) VINZENZ BULHART: *Textkritische Studien zum lateinischen Flavius Josephus*. In: *Mnemosyne* 6, 1953, pp. 140–157.

One of the most important advances of the period under review has been in the study of the Latin version made under Cassiodorus' direction (whenever "the Latin version" is referred to, it is this that is meant).

USSANI (187) paved the way for a scientific edition of the Latin version of the 'War' which was never issued.

BLATT's (188) brief report on the manuscripts is preliminary to his edition of 'Antiquities', Books 1–5 (189). The Latin version had not been edited, except for BOYSEN's edition in 1898 of the work 'Against Apion', since 1524, when FROBENIUS, who did not have the Greek original at hand, did so; and BLATT spent thirty years on this, the first critical edition. A great part of the introduction is taken up by a description of the 171 (including 24 previously unknown) manuscripts of the work. There is a preliminary index which, while including many words missing from the "Thesaurus", is very inadequate. Moreover, indices of medieval scribes of the manuscripts and of the owners of the manuscripts are desiderata. Unfortunately, as WILLIS (190) points out, BLATT's text is actually based not on all the manuscripts but on only a few. For this we should not fault him if his stemma were more careful. (Cf. the critique on this subject by FLUSSER [191]). What is most disconcerting is that without

warning manuscripts drop out as witnesses, only to return some time later, similarly without notice. If BLATT's transcriptions of one of the manuscripts in Plate 3 of his edition are any indication of his accuracy, he is far from trustworthy. LUNDSTRÖM (192), while generally praising BLATT's work, notes that he has, on the one hand, overlooked many major errors of the translation and, on the other hand, criticized the translator in many places, although the latter had interpreted the Greek text correctly.

SCHRECKENBERG (192a), p. 27, n. 8, has noted manuscripts overlooked by BLATT, in his edition.

BLATT's (193) typewritten manuscript of Books 6–10, based on the main codex (Ambrosianus papyraceus, of the ninth century), according to a private letter from BLATT, awaits publication; but a truly critical text remains a desideratum. Inasmuch as collation of 171 manuscripts is clearly a task that would take many years, what we need is construction of a stemma based on samplings at certain key points and then collation of the ten or fifteen most important manuscripts.

Inasmuch as the number of manuscripts is so large, the use of computers for arriving at a stemma and for selecting preferable readings may be possible and should be explored, though this would involve the massive preliminary task of getting all the readings into machine-readable form. By the time that one would have recorded all the variants it would seem as though the task would be virtually done.

Again, a concordance of the Latin version, as well as of other translations of this age, should prove useful in selecting readings and in determining the date and perhaps even the author of the translation. In particular, we may note that many errors in the manuscripts are due to the influence of the Vulgate on copyists.

One attempt at improving the Latin text, by BULHART (194), uses the *editio princeps* of FROBENIUS as its base, rather than collations of the manuscripts; and his emendations are generally convincing both palaeographically and in meaning.

## 5.6: Individual Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions of the Latin Version

- (195) KARL H. USENER: The Provenance of the Rylands Manuscript of Flavius Josephus. In: Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 34, 1951–52, pp. 247–249.
- (196) FRANZ BLATT: Un nouveau manuscrit du Josèphe latin. In: Estudis Luis Nicolau d'Olwer, vol. 1. Barcelona 1961 (1966), pp. 17–20 (= Estudis Romànics 8).
- (197) ANDRÉE DE BOSQUE: A proposito di un manoscritto della Biblioteca universitaria di Valenza: il 'De bello judaico' di Giuseppe Flavio. In: Commentari 16, 1965, pp. 245–257.
- (198) WALTER CAHN: An Illustrated Josephus from the Meuse Region in Merton College, Oxford. In: Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 29, 1966, pp. 295–310.
- (199) WILHELM STÜWER: Zur Geschichte einer rheinischen Handschrift (Flavius Josephus, Berlin, Cod. lat. fol. 296). In: Aus Kölnischer und rheinischer Geschichte. Festgabe Arnold Gütsches zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet. Herausgegeben von HANS BLUM (= Veröffentlichungen des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins, vol. 29). Köln 1969. Pp. 163–178.

- (200) ARON FREIMANN: Incunables about Jews and Judaism. In: ISIDORE EPSTEIN, EPHRAIM LEVINE and CECIL ROTH, edd., *Essays in honour of Joseph H. Hertz*. London 1944. Pp. 159–186.

A number of individual manuscripts of the Latin version have received special study. USENER (195) has fixed, by a study of the decorated initials, the place of origin of a twelfth-century manuscript of the Latin Josephus as the Abbey of Notre-Dame-Bonne-Espérance at Vellereille-les-Brayeux in Hainaut.

BLATT (196) has studied a relatively less important and more faulty manuscript of the Lenin Library in Moscow of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century containing the Latin version of 'Antiquities', Books 1–12, and notes a number of neologisms in it.

DE BOSQUE (197) discusses a fifteenth-century manuscript of the 'War' and, in particular, its miniatures, the style of which is characteristic of the Paduan School and which up to now has been attributed to GASPARA ROMANO (fl. 1500).

CAHN (198) has described the most extensively illustrated manuscript of Josephus extant prior to the thirteenth century, a twelfth-century manuscript of the Latin version. He tries by comparative analysis to identify some of the iconographic precedents which stand behind the historiated initials and connects the style of the art work with a group of Biblical manuscripts from Liège. The present writer would like to suggest that the illustrated Passover Haggadahs may go back to such illustrations.

STÜWER (199) traces the fascinating history of a twelfth-century manuscript, particularly in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, citing its use by several humanists, notably CINCINNIIUS (JOHANNES KRUYSHAER), and its relation to early printed editions of Josephus, and remarking that the printing from this manuscript was even the occasion of a lawsuit in 1535–1539.

FREIMANN (200) has described a printed edition of the Latin Josephus by JOHANN MENTELIN in STRASSBURG in 1471–1473 (?) and an edition of the version in Paris in 1476 (?).

### 5.7: Authorship of the Latin Josephus

- (201) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. to A.D. 135)*, revised and edited by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973. Pp. 43–64: Josephus (revised by TESSA RAJAK).
- (202) GIULIANO USSANI: *Studi preparatori ad una edizione della traduzione latina in sette libri del 'Bellum Judaicum'*. Roma 1944. (= *Bolletino del Comitato per la Preparazione dell'Edizione nazionale dei Classici greci e latini* N. S. 1, 1945, pp. 86–102).

Cassiodorus sent his monks to read the 'War' in a translation in seven books, adding that the translation was ascribed, according to the manuscripts, to Jerome, Ambrose, or Rufinus. In our manuscripts the translation is usually ascribed to Rufinus, sometimes to Jerome. The fact that Cassiodorus describes the translation as having extraordinary diction leads RAJAK, the reviser of the chapter on Josephus in the new SCHÜRER (201), to ascribe it to Hegesippus, who

wrote in a fine Sallustian style. But this, we may reply, is unlikely, since Hege-sippus, at least as we have him, is in five books, whereas Cassiodorus says the 'War' is in the Latin, as in the Greek, in seven books. Only Hege-sippus – and not the Latin Josephus – is ascribed to Ambrose, and so we sense that Cassio-dorus has confused Hege-sippus with the Latin version.

USSANI (202) remains uncertain as to the identity of the translator of the 'War' but argues that it cannot be Rufinus, since no translation of Josephus is mentioned in Gennadius' catalogue of Rufinus' translations.

### 5.8: Importance of the Latin Version

- (203) GEORGE C. RICHARDS and ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: Critical Notes on Josephus' 'Antiquities'. In: *Classical Quarterly* 31, 1937, pp. 170–177; 33, 1939, pp. 180–183.
- (204) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Einige Vermutungen zum Josephustext. In: *Theokratia: Jahrbuch des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum* 1, 1967–1969 (Leiden 1970), pp. 64–75.
- (205) DAVID FLUSSER, rev.: FRANZ BLATT, ed., *The Latin Josephus, I: Introduction and Text, The Antiquities (in Hebrew)*. In: *Kirjath Sefer* 34, 1958–1959, pp. 458–463.
- (206) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Prolegomenon*. In: MONTAGUE R. JAMES, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. New York 1971. Pp. ix–clxix.
- (206a) FRANCIS J. WITTY: Book Terms in the Vivarium Translations. In: *Classical Folia* 28, 1974, pp. 62–82.
- (206b) SVEN LUNDSTRÖM: *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der christlichen Latinität*. Lund 1955.

The chief value of the Latin version is to aid in reconstructing the Greek text, since the Latin translation is about half a millennium earlier than our oldest Greek manuscript. RICHARDS and SHUTT (203) have noted the usefulness of the version, particularly in reconstructing proper names (even when it itself is corrupt) and in filling in lacunae. SCHRECKENBERG's (204) emendations, however, inspired by the Latin translation, show the limitations of this approach.

In addition, the Latin version, as FLUSSER (205) has noted, is an important source for the Latin literary language of the period when it was made, and likewise is significant for the theory of translation of this era (a study of it would probably shed light on the method of translation of the Vulgate and of Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' into Latin, as I [206], pp. xxvi–xxvii, have suggested).

WITTY (206a) has done an interesting study of the art of translation employed by Cassiodorus and his 'team' in rendering the Greek terms for writing materials, scribes, script, archives, etc., in the 'Historia Tripartita' and Josephus' 'Antiquities' and 'Against Apion'. He concludes that the translators generally did not go about their work in a systematic manner, except when the meanings of the technical terms had become firmly established in customary usage, and that they were apparently not concerned by their general lack of consistency in rendering these technical terms.

LUNDSTRÖM (206b) shows the value of the Latin version of Josephus' 'Against Apion' by often reconstructing the Greek that it is translating. He presents valuable comments on its vocabulary and syntax and especially on the

errors made by the translator, classifying the types, such as the confusion of sounds.

The Latin version also had considerable influence on medieval literature, and especially on the religious disputes between Jews and non-Jews. The Latin version, consequently, because of its widespread use, is often helpful in reconstructing the text of medieval writers, such as Peter Comestor, who quarried from it. We may add that the Latin Josephus was extremely popular during the period of the Crusades, since it was regarded as a valuable source of information on the Holy Land and its history. FLUSSER (205), however, is wrong in noting its importance for Josippon, which, he says, is based for the most part on the Latin Josephus; actually it is based on Hegesippus.

### 5.9: The Syriac Version

- (206c) ALLISON P. HAYMAN, ed. and trans.: *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew* (*Corpus Christianorum Orientalium*, 338 (text); 339 (trans.)). Louvain 1973.
- (206d) HEIMANN KOTTEK: *Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet*. Diss. Leipzig. Berlin 1886.
- (206e) THEODOR NÖLDEKE, rev.: HEIMANN KOTTEK, *Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet*. In: *Literarisches Centralblatt* (Leipzig) 1886, pp. 881–884.

HAYMAN (206c) argues that there existed a Syriac translation of the full 'War' and not merely of the sixth book, that this translation was made directly from the Greek and was very literal but of very poor quality. KOTTEK (206d), in his edition of the Syriac version of Book 6, had declared that our Greek text is a modified version of the Syriac; HAYMAN follows NÖLDEKE (206e) is contesting this. He suggests that a collation of the Syriac with the Slavonic version would throw additional light on the textual affinities of both versions.

## 6: The Slavonic Version

### 6.0: The Text of the Slavonic Version and Translations Thereof

- (207) RALPH MARCUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: L. A. LOETSCHER, ed., *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge: An Extension of the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Grand Rapids 1955. Vol. 1, p. 614.
- (208) ROBERT EISLER: The Messiah Jesus (trans. into English by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE of his IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC). London 1931. Appendix 25: Select Bibliography on the Slavonic Josephus Problem, pp. 624–630.
- (209) VIKTOR M. ISTRIN, ed.: *La prise de Jérusalem de Josèphe le Juif*. Printed under the direction of ANDRÉ VAILLANT, translated into French by PIERRE PASCAL. 2 vols. Paris 1934–1938; rpt. Monaco 1964.
- (210) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: *Istorija iudeskoij vojny Josifa Flavija etc.* (= History of the War of the Jews of Flavius Josephus in Old Russian). Moscow and Leningrad 1958.
- (211) S. SZYSZMAN, rev.: N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ, *Istorija iudeskoij vojny Josifa Flavija*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 1, 1959, pp. 451–458.
- (212) ANDRÉ VAILLANT, rev.: N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ, *Istorija iudeskoij vojny Josifa Flavija*. In: *Semítica* 9, 1959, pp. 89–93.
- (213) GIUSEPPE FERMEGLIA: *Contributi alla critica testuale paleoslava*. In: *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo, Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche* 102, 1968, pp. 213–255.

MARCUS (207), writing in 1955, says that there have been four significant additions to our knowledge of Josephus since 1910, and one of them is the study of the Slavonic translation of the 'War'. A more thorough knowledge of the Slavonic text may even on occasion help us to reconstruct the original Greek, though it is based on an apparently inferior Greek text.

In view of the tremendous amount of discussion of the Slavonic version (called 'The Capture of Jerusalem') of the 'Jewish War', especially during the 1920's and early 1930's (see EISLER [208] for an extensive bibliography), it is surprising that there was no complete critical edition of the version until ISTRIN (209) published his with a French translation by PASCAL on opposite pages, with notes, and with a brief lexicon at the end of volume 2 by VAILLANT. The French translation has now been reissued as a paperback with slight corrections, with notes reduced to a minimum, and with a new preface. Another critical edition, that of MEŠČERSKIJ (210), to judge from the reviews by SZYSZMAN (211) and VAILLANT (212), represents important advances. FERMEGLIA (213) suggests a number of emendations in Slavonic texts, notably the 'War', which improve the text or justify divergences from the Greek.

## 6.1: The Language of the Slavonic Version

- (214) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58, 1967–68, pp. 173–203.
- (215) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: *Istorija iudeskoj vojny Josifa Flavija etc.* (= History of the War of the Jews of Flavius Josephus in Old Russian). Moscow and Leningrad 1958.
- (216) EVA KRULL: *Zur Bildsprache des altrussischen Josephus Flavius*. Diss., Bonn 1959.
- (217) MOISEI M. KOPYLENKO: O jazyke drevne-russkogo perevoda 'Istorii Iudesjskoj vojny' Iusifa Flavija (Glagol'no-immenye frazeologizmy) (in Russian = On the Language of the Old Russian Translation of Josephus Flavius' History of the Judean War [the infinitive phrases]). In: *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 20, 1961, pp. 164–183.

The language of the version, as ZEITLIN (214) points out, is not Slavonic but Old North Russian (see the philological evidence in MEŠČERSKIJ [215], pp. 90–96) and contains many Greek words which came into vogue in the Byzantine period.

A doctoral thesis by KRULL (216) is a study of the similes, metaphors, personifications, and other figures of speech in the version. KRULL's chief interest is in paving the way for a study of the relationship of the version to Old Russian literature generally. There is an extensive bibliography (pp. 216–221), particularly of Russian works bearing on the subject.

According to the latest editor, MEŠČERSKIJ (215), in an obvious display of national pride, the translator was a man of great talent with a creative bent; and the Vilna Manuscript of the Slavonic version is thus one of the most precious monuments of medieval Russian literature.

KOPYLENKO (217) makes a special study of the infinitive constructions.

## 6.2: The Date, Source, Authorship, and Purpose of the Slavonic Josephus

- (218) ALEXANDER BERENDTS: *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im slavischen 'De Bello Judaico' des Josephus*. Leipzig 1906.
- (219) ALEXANDER BERENDTS and KONRAD GRASS, trans.: *Flavius Josephus, Vom Jüdischen Kriege Buch I–IV, nach der slavischen Übersetzung deutsch herausgegeben und mit dem griechischen Text verglichen*. 2 vols. Dorpat 1924–1927.
- (220) VIKTOR M. ISTRIN, ed.: *La prise de Jérusalem de Josèphe le Juif*. Printed under the direction of ANDRÉ VAILLANT, translated into French by PIERRE PASCAL. 2 vols. Paris 1934–1938; rpt. Monaco 1964.
- (221) ROBERT EISLER: *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*, 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30. Abridged translation into English by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE: *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus' Recently Discovered Capture of Jerusalem and Other Jewish and Christian Sources*. London 1931.
- (222) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus on Jesus*. Philadelphia 1931.
- (223) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58, 1967–68, pp. 173–203.
- (224) HARALD FUCHS: *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*. Berlin 1938. 2nd ed., Berlin 1964.
- (225) NIKOLAI K. GUDZII: *History of Early Russian Literature*. Trans. from the 2nd Russian ed. by SUSAN W. JONES. New York 1949.

- (226) JOHN STRUGNELL: Josephus, Flavius. In: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7, 1967, pp. 1120–1123.
- (227) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: *Istorija iudeškoj vojny Josifa Flavija etc.* (in Russian: = *History of the War of the Jews of Flavius Josephus in Old Russian*). Moscow and Leningrad 1958.
- (228) S. SZYSZMAN, rev.: N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ, *Istorija iudeškoj vojny Josifa Flavija*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 1, 1959, pp. 451–458.
- (229) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: *Znachenie drevneslavianskikh perevodov dlja vosstanovleniia ikh arkhetyfov* (in Russian: = *The Importance of Old Slavic Translations for the Reconstruction of Their Archetypes*). In: ANDREI N. ROBINSON, ed., *Issledovaniia po slavianskomu literaturovediiu i folkloristike*. Sovetskii komitet slavistov, Akademiia Nauk SSR. Moscow 1960. Pp. 61–94.
- (230) ALFONS HÖCHERL: *Zur Übersetzungstechnik des altrussischen „Jüdischen Kriege“ des Josephus Flavius*. Diss., München 1969. Rpt. München 1970 (= *Slavistische Beiträge*, Bd. 46).

BERENDTS (218), in an article written before his translation with GRASS (219) of the Slavonic version into German and before the translation of PASCAL (220) into French, had hypothesized that the Slavonic version had been translated directly from the Aramaic version in which Josephus had originally written the 'Jewish War'.

EISLER (221) at first accepted this view. When evidence was cited that it was translated from a Greek text, EISLER suggested that Josephus had at first made a rough draft of his work in Aramaic, which was translated into Greek by Josephus' assistants, and that the Slavonic version was later made on the basis of the Greek by a Judaizing sect in Russia in the fifteenth century.

ZEITLIN (222) vehemently and, on the whole, successfully refuted EISLER; to ZEITLIN, who made, in his zeal, a special trip to Russia to study the Slavonic version, it was a seventh-century Byzantine paraphrase of the Greek Josephus, with indications that the writer also knew Hegesippus. ZEITLIN (223) later changed his mind as to the date, ascribing it to the eleventh century.

FUCHS (224), on the basis of a comparison with other Byzantine writings of the period, concluded that it was done by a Byzantine writer of the twelfth or thirteenth century.

In a convincing work GUDZII (225), however, notes that the ideas, terminology, and phraseology are those of Russian works, notably chronicles, of the middle of the eleventh century, especially in battle scenes and similes, as well as in rhythmic patterns.

By a different route STRUGNELL (226) arrives at a similar conclusion of a date in the tenth or eleventh century, noting the close textual relationship of the Slavonic version to a Byzantine text which lacks the additional material.

The question of date and the language from which the translation was made seems to have been settled by MEŠČERSKIJ (227), for an evaluation of whom I rely upon the review by SZYSZMAN (228). By a careful linguistic analysis MEŠČERSKIJ concludes that the translation was made not from Aramaic but from Greek in the eleventh century.

In a later article MEŠČERSKIJ (229) stresses that the significant differences in style, together with the additions and omissions in the translation, must be considered the original work of the translator. Like EISLER, MEŠČERSKIJ connects the



translation with the Khazars, who had been converted to Judaism in the eighth century, but he finds much Christian phraseology in it and argues that it was used in the ideological struggle against the Khazars.

HÖCHERL (230), after a full-scale study of the Slavonic Josephus, concludes, from the use of such constructions as the articular infinitive, that the source was Greek, which only in unessential details diverges from the text printed by NIESE. He says that additions and omissions, with few exceptions, are to be attributed to the translator, who did his work not in South Slavic territory but in Kievan Russia.

### 6.3: Problems of Genuineness, Omissions, and Additions of the Slavonic Version

- (231) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (232) FRANCIS I. ANDERSEN: *The Diet of John the Baptist*. In: *Abr-Nahrain* 3, 1961–62, pp. 60–74.
- (233) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58, 1967–68, pp. 173–203.
- (234) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity*. Manchester 1967. Trans. into French by GEORGES and BÉATRICE FORMENTELLI: *Jésus et les Zélotes*, Paris 1976.
- (235) RUPERT FURNEAUX: *The Roman Siege of Jerusalem*. New York 1972; London 1973.
- (236) ALEXANDER BERENDTS: *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im slavischen 'De Bello Judaico' des Josephus*. Leipzig 1906.
- (237) VIKTOR M. ISTRIN, ed.: *La prise de Jérusalem de Josèphe le Juif*. Printed under the direction of ANDRÉ VAILLANT, trans. into French by PIERRE PASCAL. 2 vols. Paris 1934–38; rpt. Monaco 1964.
- (238) NIKOLAI K. GUDZII: *History of Early Russian Literature*. Trans. from the 2nd Russian ed. by SUSAN W. JONES. New York 1949. Pp. 57–63.
- (239) ROBERT EISLER: *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (240) SALOMON REINACH: *Orpheus; histoire générale des religions*. Paris 1909. Trans. from French by FLORENCE SIMMONDS: *Orpheus: A History of Religions*. London 1909. Pp. 246–249.
- (241) H. W. KARS: *Der älteste nichtchristliche Jesusbericht*. In: *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 108, 1937, pp. 40–64.
- (242) WALTHER BIENERT: *Der älteste nichtchristliche Jesusbericht. Josephus über Jesus. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des altrussischen 'Josephus'*. Halle 1936.
- (243) AGOSTINO GOETHALS: *La versione slava di Giuseppe Flavio*. In: *Religio* 14, 1938, pp. 250–265.
- (244) HENDRIK VAN DER LOOS: *Jezus Messias-Koning. Een speciaal Onderzoek naar de Vraag of Jesus van Nazaret politieke Bedoelingen heeft nagestreeft* (Academisch Proefschrift). Assen 1942.
- (245) KARL L. SCHMIDT: *Der Todesprozess des Messias Jesus: Die Verantwortung der Juden, Heiden und Christen für die Kreuzigung Jesu Christi*. In: *Judaica* (Zürich) 1, 1945, pp. 1–40.
- (246) FELIX SCHEIDWEILER: *Sind die Interpolationen im altrussischen Josephus wertlos?* In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43, 1950–51, pp. 155–178.
- (247) SABBAS C. AGOURIDES: *To problēma tōn prosthēkōn tēs Slauonikēs metaphraseōs tou*

- Ioudaikou polemou tou Iōsēpou kai hē en autais peri tou Baptistou kai tou Iēsou Khristou marturia. Athens 1954.
- (248) PAUL-LOUIS COUCHOUD: Les textes relatifs à Jesus dans la version slave de Josèphe. In: *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 93, 1926, pp. 44–64.
- (249) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: A Commentary on the Book of Habakkuk: Important Discovery or Hoax? In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 235–247.
- (250) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus on Jesus*. Philadelphia 1931.
- (251) JAMES W. JACK: The Historic Christ: An Examination of Dr. Robert Eisler's Theory, according to the Slavonic Version of Josephus and the Other Sources. London 1933.
- (252) N. A. MEŠČERSKIĖ: Istorija iudejskoiĖ vojny Josifa Flavija, etc. (in Russian: = History of the War of the Jews of Flavius Josephus in Old Russian). Moscow and Leningrad 1958.
- (253) JOSEPH SPENCER KENNARD JR.: Slavonic Josephus: A Retraction. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 281–283.
- (254) ARIE RUBINSTEIN: Observations on the Old Russian Version of Josephus' Wars. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2, 1957, pp. 329–348.
- (255) HAIM COHN: The Trial and Death of Jesus (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1968. Trans. into English: New York 1971.
- (255a) HUGH SCHONFIELD: According to the Hebrews: A New Translation of the Jewish Life of Jesus (The "Toldoth Jeshu"), with an inquiry into the nature of its sources and special relationship to the lost Gospel according to the Hebrews. London 1937.
- (255b) GÖSTA LINDESKOG: Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitlichen Judentum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung. Leipzig 1938; rpt. Darmstadt 1973.
- (225c) LÉON HERRMANN: Chrestos: Témoignages païens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle. Brussels 1970.
- (255d) VIRGIL R. L. FRY: The Warning Inscriptions from the Herodian Temple. Diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky 1974.
- (255e) JOHANN MAIER: Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung. Darmstadt 1978.

Despite the occasional specifically Josephan phraseology, the predominant Jewish coloring, and omissions that might indicate that the version was made from a shortened Aramaic original, unfortunately no one has made a systematic study of the omissions in the version. There has long been a suspicion as to the genuineness of the version because, as THACKERAY (231), p. 152, has noted, the manuscripts containing it are late, it is derived from a Greek text which NIESE regarded as inferior, there is no clear attestation in early writers, and it is apparently dependent on the New Testament, as, for example, in the story of Herod Philip and Herodias and in the reasons given by the Roman procurators for not taking action against the early Christians. In particular, there are a number of additions in the Slavonic version which are not found in the Greek Josephus, notably a statement of how he saved his life through manipulation of the lots at Jotapata, a description of two dreams by Herod, a specification of the oaths taken on admission to the order of Essenes, moralizings on Divine providence and on Herod's sins and punishment, the Zealots' disregard of the Biblical warnings, a secret debate by the priests at the time of Herod explaining the prophecy of Daniel regarding the Messiah, the ruse of Vitellius at the battle of Bedriacum, two attacks on the venality of the Latins, and, most particularly, passages on John the Baptist and Jesus. Still, THACKERAY originally accepted the version as authentic, only to recant shortly before his death.

The additions regarding John and Jesus, who are referred to respectively as "the wild man" and "the wonder-worker," have occasioned particular comment. The wild man is the leader of a political movement commencing twenty years earlier than in the New Testament. He eats "tree sprouts," not "wood shavings," as ANDERSEN (232) notes, and is so extreme in his asceticism that he even abstains from unleavened bread on Passover. A political aspect is likewise given to the wonder-worker, who is vainly urged by 150 of his close disciples to lead a revolt against the Romans. Pilate, whose wife had been healed by him, arrests but then releases him, only to be induced by a bribe of thirty talents from the Jews to deliver him to them for crucifixion. We are told that he was crucified by the Jews for announcing the destruction of the city and the desolation of the Temple.

Are these passages specifically interpolated and hence of no value for the study of Josephus, as ZEITLIN (233) argues, or are they translations from the text being rendered by the translator and hence of value in checking a number of problems left by the Gospels, notably whether, as BRANDON (234) and FURNEAUX (235) in particular have stressed, Jesus was a political revolutionary?

BERENDTS (236) and ISTRIN (237) had presented the hypothesis that Josephus revised his original Greek translation, omitting all passages which might displease the Jews. But as GUDZII (238) has pointed out, Josephus could hardly, as a Jew, have spoken with such sympathy of John and Jesus, and, we might add, with such antipathy of the role of the Jews. The additions, he notes, have the stylistic peculiarities of the rest of the work.

EISLER (239), who suggested that the translation was made by a Judaizing sect in the fifteenth century, could not, of course, state that such a sect would go even further than the New Testament in ascribing the crucifixion to the Jews; and so he admitted that there were some interpolations, a view which was followed by REINACH (240).

KARS (241) attacks EISLER (239) and defends BIENERT (242) in arguing, on internal grounds, that the Jesus and John passages in the Slavonic Josephus are due to an interpolation, not to Josephus. These interpolated passages, says KARS, were inserted during the eleventh century and reflect the conflict between the Roman and Byzantine Churches.

GOETHALS (243) suggests that the additions in the Slavonic version concerning John and Jesus had a Christian origin in the second century.

I have not seen VAN DER LOOS' (244) discussion, pp. 211-216, of the passage about Jesus in the Slavonic Josephus.

SCHMIDT (245) says that the picture in the Slavonic version of Jesus as a messianic activist rebel is supported by the Gospels, and that the Slavonic Josephus merely represents a coarsened version.

SCHEIDWEILER (246) carries the interpolations back ever further to a Jewish history of Josephus' day but opposed to Josephus in outlook; but this, we may remark, is a mere conjecture, there being no evidence for a history of that period with such a Christian bias against the Jews.

AGOURIDES (247) has an extensive, valuable commentary in modern Greek on the principal twenty-two additions in the Slavonic version and suggests, on

the basis of the theology of the additions, a date between 190 and 250 for the Christian interpolations, thus agreeing with COUCHOUD (248), p. 56; but such a criterion, we may retort, seems unreliable, both because the passages are too brief and insufficiently distinctive from a theological point of view and also because theologies are often revived at a later date.

No doubt ZEITLIN (249) is correct in stating that if the passages about Jesus were at such an early date in the original Greek text from which the Slavonic version was made, the Church Fathers would have cited them since they go further than even the New Testament in ascribing guilt to the Jews. The Jesus passages, says ZEITLIN (250), come from the 'Acta Pilati'; but, we may reply, the passages in the Slavonic version are too brief to admit of proof.

JACK (251), in another critique of EISLER's theory, suggests that the Jesus passages were interpolated by Orthodox Christians in answer to the Judaizing sect cited by EISLER. But, we may note, the definitive studies by MEŠČERSKIJ (252) indicate that the translation was completed long before the Judaizing sect made its appearance; and if, with MEŠČERSKIJ, we say that the event that produced the translation was the conversion of the Khazars, this is too early, since it occurred in the eighth century, and a reaction against them, to be effective, would probably have been undertaken long before the eleventh century. That the translation, or at least the passage about Jesus, is the work of a Christian seems clear from the words that "they [the Jews] crucified him according to the law of their fathers." If the author were a Jew, as KENNARD (253) is forced to admit, he would have written "our fathers."

The question of the source of the statement that John was a revolutionary who accepted only G-d as his ruler has been raised by ANDERSEN (232), who notes that though this interpolation has undoubted affinities with the view of the Fourth Philosophy (Antiquities 18. 23), the translator did not, as RUBINSTEIN (254) has demonstrated, use the 'Antiquities', and hence the resemblance is due to indirect transmission, probably through George Hamartolos, who was much indebted to Josephus and whose chronicles were much used by Russian chroniclers.

COHN (255) disagrees with the theory that the Slavonic Josephus was written by a Jewish apologist other than Josephus who wanted to satisfy his Jewish readers that Jesus had been deservedly crucified by the Jews. It is incredible, he says, that a Jewish apologist would take the crucifixion out of Pilate's hands and make the Jews responsible. We may, however, suggest that perhaps the author wanted to prove to the Romans that the Jews had tried to nip the movement in the bud.

SCHONFIELD (255a) rejects EISLER (239) and contends that the additions in the Slavonic Josephus are interpolations, noting several close verbal parallels between it and the medieval Hebrew life of Jesus known as 'Toledoth Yeshu'. He suggests that both ultimately go back to a lost Gospel of the Hebrews. He concludes that it is probable that the Greek text on which the Slavonic Josephus and the 'Toledoth Yeshu' rest dates from the eighth century. We may observe, however, that the parallels which SCHONFIELD cites between the Slavonic version and the 'Toledoth Yeshu' are hardly striking; and the differences in

incidental matters, such as the number of followers of Jesus (150 in the Slavonic Josephus, 310 in the "Toledoth Yeshu"), argue for independent sources.

LINDESKOG (255b), pp. 191–196, summarizes the scholarship on the Jesus passages in the 'Testimonium Flavianum' and in the Slavonic Josephus, with particular attention to ZEITLIN's views.

HERRMANN (255c), pp. 104–115, commenting on the passages in the Slavonic version pertaining to Jesus, concludes that the author is a Christian, noting that Halosis (the Slavonic version) 1. 31. 6 (= War 1. 641–646) alludes to the city of Charan in Mesopotamia and to the return of Abraham by G-d far from his native place, precisely the point that is made in Hippolytus, *Philosophoumena* 10. 30. But, we may contend, it seems hard to believe that a Christian, unless we are dealing with a heretical group and perhaps with a non-canonical Gospel, would have failed to mention Jesus' name at all, that he would not have stated that he was the Messiah, that he would equivocate by declaring that he was "something more than a man" but that he would "not call him an angel", that in many things he disobeyed the Law, that his followers expected him to rout the Roman troops, and that the Jewish rabbis gave thirty talents to Pilate in order to put him to death, in disagreement with the Gospel account.

FRY (255d), pp. 287–289, contains a brief appendix summarizing the debate concerning the Slavonic version. He agrees, on the whole, with ZEITLIN in preferring the Greek to the Slavonic version and hence regards the statement (War 5. 194) that the warning to foreigners to keep away from the Temple was in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew characters (whereas the Greek inscription states merely that it was in Greek and Latin) as due to an interpolation.

MAIER (255e), pp. 46–47, comments briefly on the Jesus passage in the Slavonic Josephus.

#### 6.4: The Slavonic Version, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Essenes

- (256) MARC PHILONENKO: La notice du Josèphe slave sur les Esséniens. In: *Semitica* 6, 1956, pp. 69–73.
- (257) ARIE RUBINSTEIN: The Essenes according to the Slavonic Version of Josephus' Wars. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 6, 1956, pp. 307–308.
- (258) ARIE RUBINSTEIN: Observations on the Old Russian Version of Josephus' Wars. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2, 1957, pp. 329–348.
- (259) ANDRÉ VAILLANT: Le Josèphe slave et les Esséniens. In: *Semitica* 8, 1958, pp. 39–40.

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has renewed interest in the Slavonic version, particularly in its account of the Essenes. PHILONENKO (256) asserts that the Scrolls, especially the Rule of the Community, confirm the account of the Essenes in the Slavonic Josephus, and that the Slavonic version, in particular, confirms DUPONT-SOMMER's hypothesis identifying the legislator with the Scrolls' Master of Righteousness. PHILONENKO concludes, in enthusiastic haste, that the antiquity of the additions of the Slavonic version is certain and their authenticity probable. If so, the version may preserve other valid traditions and must therefore be examined further.

RUBINSTEIN (257), independently examining the same passages as those cited by PHILONENKO, finds them faintly reminiscent of two passages in the Scrolls and not, as the ISTRIN-PASCAL-VAILLANT edition would have it, wholly unrelated to the nature of the Essene sect.

In a careful article based on those passages that are admitted to be genuine, RUBINSTEIN (258) concludes that there is not a single clear case of a Semiticism in the version and that omissions are due to abridgement of a longer Greek text. In a re-examination of the account of the Essenes, RUBINSTEIN reverses himself and finds no possible reference to the sectaries of the Qumran Scrolls but rather postulates that the addition is suspiciously like an embellishment inserted by a pious Russian translator or an equally pious Byzantine copyist of the Greek text. The variations are often in accord with the Latin version and may, according to RUBINSTEIN's conjecture, have been transmitted from a Greek text of a family of manuscripts no longer extant, in which case their value is enhanced.

VAILLANT (259) corrects the Slavonic text so as to eliminate a reference to the military art of the Essenes; this correction, it may be noted, is confirmed by the text of MEŠČERSKIJ.

### 6.5: Translations Dependent upon the Slavonic Version

- (260) ROBERT EISLER: *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (261) RENÉ DRAGUET : *Le juif Josèphe, témoin du Christ? A propos du livre de M. R. Eisler*. In: *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 26, 1930, pp. 833–879.
- (262) JACQUES MOREAU: *Les plus anciens témoignages profanes sur Jésus*. Brussels 1944. Pp. 11–36.

EISLER (260), DRAGUET (261), pp. 839ff., and MOREAU (262), p. 36, have called our attention to a Rumanian version, known only by some fragments in a manuscript in the Gaster Collection in London and published by EISLER. This translation goes back to a Polish version and contains the additions found in the Slavonic version. A Latin translation has been published by DRAGUET (261). Though it contains no new elements, further study may well prove useful in arriving at our text of and in elucidating the Slavonic version.

## 7: Josippon

### 7.0: Josippon (Josefon, Yosephon, Josephon) (the Hebrew Version of the 'Jewish War'): General

- (263) EDWIN WOLF: The First Book of Jewish Authorship Printed in America. In: *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* 60, 1970–71, pp. 229–234.
- (264) LUCIEN WOLF: Josippon. In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 15, Cambridge 1911, p. 521.
- (265) AUGUSTIN CALMET: *Dictionnaire historique, critique, chronologique, géographique et littéral de la Bible*. 4 vols. New ed., Paris 1730.
- (266) AUGUSTIN CALMET: *Dictionary of the Holy Bible; with the Biblical Fragments*, by CHARLES TAYLOR, 9th ed. Vol. 1. London 1847. Pp. 761–762.
- (267) DAVID FLUSSER: Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 122–132.
- (268) UMBERTO CASSUTO: Josippon. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 9, Berlin 1932, pp. 420–425.
- (269) SALO W. BARON: *Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Vol. 6. New York 1958. Pp. 189–195, 417–421.
- (270) HIRSCH J. ZIMMELS: Aspects of Jewish Culture: Historiography. In: CECIL ROTH, ed.: *The World History of the Jewish People*, Second Series. Vol. 2: The Dark Ages. New Brunswick, New Jersey 1966. Pp. 277–281.
- (271) JOHN STRUGNELL: Josippon. In: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7, 1967, p. 1124.
- (272) DAVID FLUSSER: The Author of the Book of Josippon: His Personality and His Age (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126. Rpt. in his: *Josippon: The Original Version MS. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements (Texts and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project)*. Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 10–27.
- (273) DAVID FLUSSER: Josippon. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 296–298.
- (274) ISRAEL ZINBERG: *The History of Literature among Jews (in Yiddish)*. Vol. 2<sup>2</sup> (Vilna 1935), pp. 185–199. Trans. into Hebrew, vol. 1, Tel-Aviv 1955, pp. 334–345. Trans. into English by BERNARD MARTIN, vol. 2, Cleveland 1972, pp. 139–150.
- (275) JACOB REINER: *The Jewish War: Variations in the Historical Narratives in the Texts of Josephus and the Yosippon*. Diss., Ph.D., Dropsie College, Philadelphia 1972.
- (275a) ALEXANDER D. GOODE: *A Critical Analysis of the Book of Yosippon as Compared to Josephus and Other Sources with a Discussion of the History of the Literary Problem of Its Composition and Style*. Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1937 (typewritten).

Though E. WOLF (263), p. 231, seems correct in regarding as “somewhat naive” L. WOLF’s statement (264) that the popularity of Josippon is a link in the chain of events which culminated in the readmission of the Jews to England by Cromwell, there can be no doubt that this version has historically been of great

importance both for the Jewish and the non-Jewish world – a significance that remains to be documented in detail.

Passions run high with regard to the work, so that CALMET (265) (266), for example, exclaims, “What falsehoods and impostures are here!” Yet the work is frequently cited by CALMET himself.

FLUSSER (267) asserts that when his critical edition of Josippon appears, it will show that Josippon is not a folk-book but in truth the work of a gifted artist and a responsible historian.

Among older general surveys of the work the outstanding is by CASSUTO (268) in the (German) *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, easily the best Jewish encyclopedia ever published (unfortunately only half-completed when interrupted by the events of Hitler’s Germany).

A good survey, particularly of the outlook of Josippon on history and religion, will be found in BARON (269).

The best recent over-all treatment is by ZIMMELS (270), marked by judicious comments on the chief problems connected with the work.

STRUGNELL (271) and FLUSSER (272) (273) have fine brief treatments.

FLUSSER (267) has now written a more comprehensive survey of the three versions of Josippon, his sources, and his relationship to Josephus, the place and date of the origin of the work, and the relationship to the Latin Josephus, as well as the connection of the author with the name Joseph ben Gorion.

ZINBERG’S (274) popularly-oriented Yiddish work, with a general but cautious discussion of Josippon, has been translated with some revisions into Hebrew and into English.

I have not seen the apparently systematic comparison by REINER (275).

A good selective bibliography on the subject of Josippon will be found in BARON (269), vol. 6, pp. 417–421.

I have not seen GOODE (275a).

## 7.1: The Text of Josippon

- (276) MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER: *Catalogus librorum hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*. Berlin 1852–1860; rpt. Hildesheim 1964. Cols. 1547–1552.
- (277) KONRAD TRIEBER: *Bitte*. In: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 39, 1895, pp. 143–144.
- (278) HAYIM HOMINER, ed.: *Sefer Yosippon* (in Hebrew). Introduction by ABRAHAM J. WERTHEIMER. Jerusalem 1962.
- (279) ESTHER SORSCHER: *A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hegesippus, and the Yosippon*. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (280) DAVID G. FLUSSER: *A Sample Selection of the Book of Josippon in a Corrected and Revised Edition according to Various Manuscripts and the First Two Printed Editions* (in Hebrew). Edited by YITZHAK BAER. Jerusalem 1947.
- (281) DAVID FLUSSER: *Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 122–132.



- (282) HIRSCH J. ZIMMELS: Aspects of Jewish Culture: Historiography. In: CECIL ROTH, ed.: *The World History of the Jewish People*, Second Series. Vol. 2: *The Dark Ages*. New Brunswick, New Jersey 1966. Pp. 277–281.
- (283) DAVID FLUSSER: The Author of the Book of Josippon: His Personality and His Age (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126. Rpt. in his: *Josippon: The Original Version MS. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements (Texts and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project)*. Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 10–27.
- (284) JACOB REINER: The Original Hebrew Yosippon in the Chronicle of Jerahmeel. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 60, 1969–70, pp. 128–146.
- (285) MEYER WAXMAN: *A History of Jewish Literature from the Close of the Bible to Our Own Days*. Vol. 1. New York 1930. Pp. 423–425; 2nd ed., New York 1938, Pp. 419–421.
- (286) MOISE SCHWAB: Les Manuscrits du Consistoire Israélite de Paris provenant de la Gue-niza du Caire. In: *Revue des Études juives* 64, 1912, p. 118.
- (287) ARIEL TOAFF: Critical edition of the Alexander romance according to Yosephon. In preparation.
- (287a) JACOB REINER: *The Book of the Hasmonean Kings from the Chronicles of Jerahmeel*. Diss., D.H.L., Yeshiva University, New York 1966. 2 vols.
- (287b) JACOB REINER: *The Jewish War: Variations in the Historical Narratives in the Texts of Josephus and the Yosippon*. Diss., Dropsie Univ., Philadelphia 1972.
- (287c) DAVID FLUSSER, ed.: *The Josippon (Josephus Gorionides) (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem 1978.
- (287d) DAVID FLUSSER, ed.: *Josippon: The Original Version MS. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements (Text and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project, 49)*. Jerusalem 1978.

The Text of Josippon is extraordinarily complicated by the fact that there are three substantially different recensions, those of Mantua, Constantinople, and Venice. Though one or another of these texts has been printed numerous times (see, for example, the list of editions in STEINSCHNEIDER [276], as supplemented in my as yet unpublished supplement to SCHRECKENBERG's bibliography of Josephus), no critical edition based upon all of them has been published. TRIEBER (277) many years ago had announced that he was preparing a critical edition, but this was apparently never completed. HOMINER (278) prints the Venice edition, with supplements from the Mantua and Constantinople editions – an unfortunate choice, since the Constantinople edition, which contains the least amount of scribal interpolation, is the closest to the Ur-Josippon. As SORSCHER (279), pp. 91–92, has noted, despite the many additions in the Venice recension, there is only one instance where it contains information found in Hegesippus or Josephus but not in the other versions.

Many years have elapsed since FLUSSER (280) issued his thirteen-page sample of a new edition; but in his latest article (281) he announces that the work is now in press, and since then it has, indeed, appeared (287c). ZIMMELS (282) reports that some manuscripts still under investigation by FLUSSER are probably closest to the original. FLUSSER (283) asserts that the differences between the Mantua and Constantinople recensions are deliberate, that the former intentionally omitted references to Josephus as the author, a fact that he thought was understood, whereas the scribe of the Constantinople recension maintained the hypothesis that Josippon was the work composed in Hebrew by Josephus for

the Jews and consistently introduced him as the author. The Constantinople scribe was, moreover, familiar with the Latin Josephus, a fact, we may add, which BLATT and other editors of the Latin Josephus should find useful in arriving at that text. FLUSSER concludes that there existed an earlier, more accurate text which was not subject to the prejudice of the scribes and which he now proposed to ascertain.

REINER (284) has noted how closely the twelfth-century Hebrew Chronicle of Jerahmeel parallels the Mantua recension. WAXMAN (285) had stated that the text of Josippon in Jerahmeel had been included by the later copyist Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi, whereas REINER establishes that it was Jerahmeel himself who included it, since when Eleazar interpolates, he uses a text closer to that of the Constantinople recension. Hence the text of Jerahmeel is of great importance for establishing the text of Josippon, inasmuch as it contains a text of Josippon three hundred years older than the *editio princeps* of Josippon in 1480. In addition, there are valuable Geniza fragments of Josippon listed by SCHWAB (286).

In addition to FLUSSER, TOAFF (287) is likewise engaged in preparing a critical edition, restricting himself, however, to Josippon's version of the Alexander romance.

REINER (287a) has an edition of the portion of the text of Jerahmeel, a twelfth-century writer, which pertains to the Hasmonean kings, and discusses its relation to Josephus and to Josippon. Inasmuch as it was written about three centuries before the earliest publication of Josippon (Mantua in 1480), it is particularly valuable. REINER concludes that it closely follows the Mantua recension, but the references to Joseph ben Gorion as the author are found in the same instances of the narrative as in the Constantinople edition, though always in the third person.

REINER (287b), pp. 2–8, discusses the differences in the various recensions of Josippon, and he concludes that the text of Josippon preserved in Jerahmeel is the closest to the text of the Ur-Josippon, though, inasmuch as Jerahmeel is abbreviating the text, his omission of a given passage is not conclusive. REINER systematically notes the omissions and additions in Josippon as compared with Josephus; a further comparison with the Slavonic Josephus would have made this even more useful (REINER, p. 2, says that Josippon was translated into old Slavonic, but this statement is erroneous).

FLUSSER (287c) has at last published his definitive edition of Josippon, on which he had been working since the end of World War II, containing the text, brief notes, and cross references to Josephus, with translations of individual words and phrases into Latin and a number of supplementary extracts, notably that on Alexander, that entered the book in the course of time.

FLUSSER (287d) contains photocopies of the Jerusalem manuscript of Josippon (pp. 55–292) and (pp. 293–308) of a portion of Jerahmeel (Oxford Bodleian Ms. Hebrew 2797), as well as (pp. 309–318) of a portion of the Constantinople version.

## 7.2: Translations of Josippon

- (288) PETER MORVYNE (MORWYNG, MORVVYN, MORWYN): Joseph ben Gorion. A compendious (and most marveilous) history of the (latter tymes of the) Jewes commeweale. London 1558, etc.
- (289) MOSES MARX: Joseph Ben Gorion Editions. In: *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 6, 1962–64, pp. 38–42.
- (290) EDWIN WOLF: The First Book of Jewish Authorship Printed in America. In: *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* 60, 1970–71, pp. 229–234.
- (290a) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: Excerpt from the Book of Josippon in 'History of Our Time' (in Russian), *Palestinskiĭ Sbornik* 2, 1956, pp. 58–68.
- (290b) LAURENCE H. RUBENSTEIN: The Josippon of Joseph ben Gorion: A Translation of Part I with an Introduction and Source Analysis. Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College. New York 1965. Typescript.
- (290c) NORMAN PATZ: The Yosippon of Joseph ben Gorion: A Translation of Part II with an Introduction and Source Analysis. Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College. New York 1965. Typescript.
- (290d) LEONARD S. ZOLL: A Critical Translation of Joseph ben Gorion's Josippon – part III. Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College. New York 1966. Typescript.
- (291) LEONARD S. ZOLL: The Last Days of the Second Temple in Jerusalem. . . 70 C.E.: A Translation from Joseph ben Gorion's Josippon. In: *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal* 17. 3, June 1970, pp. 2–30.
- (292) ARIEL TOAFF, ed.: *Cronaca ebraica del Sepher Yosephon*. (Istituto superiore di studi ebraici del Collegio rabbinico italiano) Roma 1969.

The translation of Josippon by MORVYNE (288) went through as many editions between the mid-sixteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries, twenty-one, as did WHISTON's translation of Josephus into English in the eighteenth century. MARX (289) gives a brief description of the sixteenth-century editions. WOLF (290) notes that the translation by MORVYNE dated 1718 in Boston is the first book of Jewish authorship printed in America, though it was not actually issued until 1722. (Thus the first work of Jewish authorship to be published in America is the abridgement of L'ESTRANGE's translation of Josephus, originally published in London in 1717 and reissued in Boston in 1719). The explanation which WOLF gives for the delay in the publication of the translation of Josippon, namely to confound the competitors who were about to issue the edition of 1719 of Josephus, seems unsatisfactory, since from a business point of view the advantage lay with the one who would issue the translation first.

I have been unable to read MEŠČERSKIJ (290a), who has Josippon's version of the Alexander romance.

RUBENSTEIN (290b), PATZ (290c), and ZOLL (290d) have divided the translation of Josippon into English among themselves. They do not report any variants, even the many major ones, in the recensions. Their introductions summarize the scholarship pertaining to Josippon, with particular preference for ZEITLIN's views.

ZOLL (291) has published a spirited translation, but without introduction and notes, of a portion of Josippon. Inasmuch as there has been no complete translation of the work into English since MORVYNE's in 1558, a new translation should be undertaken now that FLUSSER has issued his critical edition. Except

for the fragmentary translation by ZOLL, the only published translation into a modern language in recent years is that by TOAFF (292) into Italian of the very first part of Josippon, containing the story of Adam through the Book of Esther.

### 7.3: Authorship and Authenticity of Josippon

- (293) HIRSCH J. ZIMMELS: Aspects of Jewish Culture: Historiography. In: CECIL ROTH, ed.: *The World History of the Jewish People*, Second Series. Vol. 2: *The Dark Ages*. New Brunswick, New Jersey 1966. Pp. 277–281.
- (294) DAVID FLUSSER: *Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 122–132.
- (295) HAYIM HOMINER, ed.: *Sefer Yosippon* (in Hebrew). Introduction by ABRAHAM J. WERTHEIMER. Jerusalem 1962.
- (295a) JACOB REINER: *The Jewish War: Variations in the Historical Narratives in the Texts of Josephus and the Yosippon*. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1972.

The name of the author has usually been given as Josippon. ZIMMELS (293) prefers Josephon; but FLUSSER (294) quite properly prefers Josippon, representing the familiar etacism of the Middle Ages and the form in the accusative found in other Greek names in the Talmudic corpus.

The amazing sixteenth-century Italian Jewish scholar AZARIAH DEI ROSSI (*Me'or Einayim* 1. 224–225 [Cassel ed., 234]) was the first who noted differences between the texts of Josephus and Josippon. He discovered large interpolations in the text and concluded that the work was by an author other than Josephus.

It seems hard to believe that as recently as 1962 HOMINER (295), in his edition of Josippon, identifies the author as Josephus and states that the Greek of Josephus was translated from Josippon, even though there are many passages in the Greek which know no parallel in Josippon or in any other version. As to the identification of the author in the manuscripts as Joseph ben Gorion, whereas the name of Josephus' father was Mattathias, he adopts the point of view of the fifteenth-century ABRAHAM ZACUTO that Josephus' father was known by both names, though there is no indication in War 2. 563, where the name Gorion appears, that this was another name for Josephus' father.

REINER (295a) remarks that the author never intended to associate himself with the name of Josippon and that he is anonymous. We may, however, reply that Jerahmeel identifies the author as Joseph ben Gorion. REINER says that this refers to Josephus, but we may remark that Josephus' father was named Mattityahu, not Gorion.

### 7.4: The Date and Place of Composition of Josippon

- (296) KONRAD TRIEBER: *Zur Kritik des Gorionides*. In: *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft*, phil.-hist. Classe, 1895, pp. 381–409.

- (297) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Slavonic Josephus and Its Relation to Josippon and Hegesippus. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 20, 1929–30, pp. 1–50, 281.
- (298) SOLOMON ZEITLIN, introduction: The First Book of Maccabees. New York 1950.
- (299) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Josippon. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 53, 1962–63, pp. 277–297.
- (300) ESTHER SORSCHER: A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hegesippus, and the Yosippon. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (301) ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: Josippon: History and Pietism. In: SAUL LIEBERMAN, ed.: *Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume*. New York 1950. Pp. 637–667. Rpt. in: ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: *Landmarks and Goals: Historical Studies and Addresses*. Philadelphia 1953. Pp. 1–34.
- (302) UMBERTO CASSUTO: Una lettera ebraica del secolo X. In: *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 29, 1918–20, pp. 97–110.
- (303) DAVID G. FLUSSER: The Author of the Book of Josippon. His Personality and His Age (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126.
- (304) SALO W. BARON: *Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Vol. 6. New York 1958. Pp. 189–195, 417–421.
- (305) ARIEL TOAFF, ed.: *Cronaca ebraica del Sepher Yosephon* (Istituto superiore di studi ebraici del Collegio rabbinico italiano). Roma 1969.
- (306) GUSTAV (= DAVID) FLUSSER: The Report on the Slavs in a Hebrew Chronicle of the Tenth Century (in Czech). In: *Česky Časopis Historický* 48–49, 1947–48, pp. 238–241.
- (307) JOHN STRUGNELL: Josippon. In: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7, 1967, p. 1124.
- (308) THEOPHIL E. MODELSKI: Die Berge Job und Schebtamo des Josippon. In: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 26, 1912, pp. 132–142.
- (309) ARIEL TOAFF: Sorrento e Pozzuoli nella letteratura ebraica del Medioevo. In: *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* (Università di Roma) 40, 1965, pp. 313–317.
- (310) ADOLF NEUBAUER: The Early Settlement of the Jews in Southern Italy. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* (Old Series) 4, 1891–92, pp. 606–625.
- (311) GIORGIO R. CARDONA: I nomi dei figli di Tôgermâh secondo il Sêpher Yôsêphôn. In: *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 41, 1966, pp. 17–28.
- (312) SARA R. DUKER: *Political Ideas in the Sefer Josippon*. Diss., M.A., Columbia University, New York 1969.
- (313) SALOMON MUNK: Notice sur Abou'l-Walid Merwan ibn-Djana'h et sur Quelques Autres Grammairiens Hébreux du Xe et du XIe Siècle. In: *Journal Asiatique*, 4th series, vol. 16, 1850, pp. 5–50.
- (314) HENRY MALTER: *Saadia Gaon: His Life and Works*. Philadelphia 1921.
- (315) JACOB MANN: *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*. Vol. 1. Cincinnati 1931. Pp. 15–16.
- (316) JACQUES BASNAGE: *L'histoire et la religion des Juifs, depuis Jesus-Christ jusqu'à present. Pour servir de supplément et de continuation à l'histoire de Joseph*. 5 vols. Rotterdam 1707.
- (317) LEOPOLD ZUNZ: In: *The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela*. Ed. ABRAHAM ASHER. Vol. 2. Berlin 1840. Pp. 246–247.
- (318) DANIEL A. CHWOLSON: Collected Essays of the Mekize Nirdamin (in Russian). In: *Kovez al-yad* 5, 1897, p. 5.
- (319) PERCY E. SCHRAMM: *Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio*. Vol. 2. Berlin 1929. Pp. 112–119. See also: *Kaiser, Könige und Päpste: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters*. Vol. 3. Stuttgart 1969. Pp. 360–368.
- (320) YITZHAK BAER: *The Book of Josippon the Jew* (in Hebrew). In: *Sefer Ben Zion Dina-burg*. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 178–205.
- (321) ISRAEL ZINBERG: *The History of Literature among Jews* (in Yiddish). Vol. 2<sup>2</sup> (Vilna 1935), pp. 185–199. Trans. into Hebrew, vol. 1, Tel Aviv 1955, pp. 334–345. Trans. into English by BERNARD MARTIN, vol. 2, Cleveland 1972, pp. 139–150.

- (322) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: *Le couronnement d'un empereur byzantin vu par un juif de Constantinople*. In: *Byzantinoslavica* 16, 1955, pp. 43–75.

On no subject connected with Josippon has there been a more vigorous debate than on the question of the date when the version was made. One school of thought goes back to TRIEBER (296), who discerned in Josippon three layers of text, one taken from Hegesippus marked by ornate speeches, one a later interpolation of the Alexander romance, and the third the original Josippon, who, he attempted to prove, restricted himself to older patristic sources. He thus concluded that the original work was composed as early as the fourth century.

ZEITLIN (297) contends that since Josippon shows familiarity with Tannaitic materials but none with Amoraic matter it must have been composed no later than the fifth century. In a later book (298) he states categorically that the work was composed in the fourth century; and in a still later book (299) the date has been pushed to the third or early fourth century, as it indeed would have to be, since the Tannaitic period ends about the year 200. ZEITLIN argues that the work ascribed to Hegesippus, which he dates in the fourth century, made use of Josippon, though, as SORSCHER (300) has shown conclusively, the very reverse is the case. NEUMAN (301) and ZEITLIN (299) note that the author was familiar with the Apocrypha, including the second and fourth books of Maccabees, as seen by the fact that Josippon identifies the martyr mother of the seven sons as Hannah, a name found only in the Apocrypha which does not appear again in Jewish writings until Josippon. Again, the author does not record the later Talmudic version of the Hanukkah miracle but only the story as found in the Books of Maccabees. NEUMAN thus concludes that the date may be even earlier than that assigned by ZEITLIN. As to the description of the coronation of Vespasian which seems to resemble that of the emperor Otto in 962, ZEITLIN explains this as a later interpolation. He similarly explains Italian words and references to Jesus. But, we may comment, on this basis one can assign an ancient date to anything and then claim that all the exceptions are interpolations. As to references to the Apocrypha, these may be explained by the undoubted fact that the translator knew Latin and thus may well have known the Books of Maccabees in the Vulgate version. Moreover, we may add, during this period a number of 'lost' Jewish traditions were recovered, as we see, for example, in midrashic material from Pseudo-Philo's *'Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum'*, which appears in the ninth century in Hrabanus Maurus after being 'lost' since its composition presumably in the first century and its translation into Latin presumably in the fourth century. If, indeed, Josippon was composed as early as TRIEBER, ZEITLIN, and NEUMAN claim it is, how, moreover, can we explain that it is never quoted or referred to until the tenth century?

The evidence for a date in the middle of the tenth century seems overwhelming: (1) A fragment found in the Cairo Geniza leads CASSUTO (302) to a date definitely prior to the middle of the tenth century; (2) FLUSSER (303) notes that one of the best manuscripts indicates that it was copied 885 years after the destruction of the Temple, which thus yields a date of 953 (according to the

reckoning of the date of the destruction then in vogue); and he concludes, as does BARON (304) after him that the work was written between 900 and 965; (3) From a linguistic and literary point of view, notably in the use of many Latin and Italian words and even Latinized forms of Italian and, in particular, the transliteration of Italian names so stressed by TOAFF (305), as well as the transcription of Slavonic names, which, as FLUSSER (306) remarks, shows that the author must have heard the Slavonic bilabial 'v', this date fits best; (4) STRUGNELL (307) notes that a tenth-century Arabic version by Zakariya ibn Said was used by Moslem historians, as well as by Christians in Egypt; (5) The geographical data, as MODELSKI (308), in his comments about the mountains which he identifies as the Alps, indicates, and as TOAFF (309) points out, in his notation about the foundation of Sorrento, which Josippon confused with Pozzuoli, as we see from the twelfth-century traveler Benjamin of Tudela, similarly fit such a date; (6) The ethnographic data, as we see in such details as the mention of Jews settled in Italian cities, as noted by NEUBAUER (310); the fact that the Russians are not yet counted among the Slavs, as noted by FLUSSER (306) (who remarks that Josippon in his ethnology follows Hegesippus, yet brings the information up to date); the presence of the Patchinaks between the Don and the Danube, which is possible only after 900, and the statement that the Arabs held Tarsus, which must be before 965, as noted by FLUSSER (303); the genealogy of the sons of Togarmah, the grandson of Japheth, as noted by CARDONA (311), all make the date even more precise; (7) The idea of kingship, as DUKER (312) notes, reflects a response to the memory of the brutal outbursts against the Jews in ninth- and tenth-century Italy; and Josippon, by advocating acquiescence in the divinely sanctioned legitimate ruling power of Rome, attempts to show that the Jews do not constitute a threat to the Eastern Roman Emperor (but, we may comment, this type of contention is less conclusive, since the arguments are hardly unique); (8) MUNK (313) remarks that Eleazar Kallir, a poet who lived sometime between the seventh and tenth centuries, mentions the city of Jotapata, spelling the name as found in the text of Josippon, in his famous elegy 'Eikhah Yoshvah Ḥavaẓe'leth ha-Sharon'; (9) The famous Jewish philosopher Saadia Gaon, who died in 942, in his commentary on Daniel 11. 18, as noted by MALTER (314), mentions Joseph ben Gorion Ha-Cohen, the reputed author of Josippon, and this would provide a *terminus ante quem* for our work; but there is a question as to whether this commentary is really by Saadia; (10) There is an undoubted reference to Josippon in a letter to Ḥisdai ibn Shaprut, the famous adviser to the caliph Abd al-Raḥmān III in Spain in the middle of the tenth century, as noted by MANN (315); (11) Adonim ibn Tamim, the famous North African Jewish exegete also known as Dunash, in the first half of the tenth century cites Josippon and indeed regards him as having composed his work in the time of the Second Temple, though this does not prove, as MUNK (313), who cites it, claims, that it was as old as the ninth or eighth century; (12) The great Talmudic scholar Rabbi Gershon Meor Hagolah (960–1028) of Mayence, in one of his penitential prayers, describes the death of Antiochus, the only Hebrew source for which at that time was Josippon; (13) The Spanish Jewish statesman-poet-scholar Samuel

Ha-Nagid and the Arab historian Ibn Hazam cite Josippon in the middle of the eleventh century.

Ever since BASNAGE (316) in the eighteenth century and ZUNZ (317) and CHWOLSON (318) in the nineteenth century, the work has been dated on the basis of the description of the coronation of Vespasian, which closely resembles the coronation of the Emperor Otto in 962. SCHRAMM (319), in his 1969 edition, presents an annotated translation of the relevant passage and suggests a date in the first half of the twelfth century, asserting that his dating is confirmed by FLUSSER; but FLUSSER, as we have noted, argues for a date in the first half of the tenth century; and it seems hardly likely that one who had seen a coronation in 962 would wait until the first half of the twelfth century to reflect this. Yet, we may remark, it does seem dangerous to derive data from the coronation scene, which is found only in the Constantinople recension and hence may be a late interpolation, as FLUSSER (303), BAER (320), ZINBERG (321), and BARON (304) all agree.

DEL MEDICO (322) goes so far on the basis of the description of the coronation as to state that we can obtain important data on the topography of Constantinople in the fifth century and on Byzantine practices with regard to coronations before Christianity profoundly modified them, and that the coronation actually refers to the beginning of the reign of Leo I in 475; but he does not realize that the passage appears to be interpolated.

In similar fashion, the battering-rams described by Josippon date from the tenth century; but this passage too, as noted by BAER (320), is found only in the Constantinople recension. And yet, when BAER attempts to find support for a tenth-century date by noting Josippon's glorification of martyrdom, he is less than convincing, since such values are found from the days of the Maccabees on.

Again, on the basis of linguistics, geography, and ethnographic data, it appears that the work was composed in southern Italy, as FLUSSER (303) has well argued; in particular, the use of Greek forms for place names indicates such a place of origin; and, as CARDONA (311) has pointed out, the origin of Josippon's information about the genealogy of the sons of Noah is Byzantine.

BAER (320) argues that the author's *Romanitas* proves that he lived in Western Italy, and not until Byzantine control; but, we may comment, the Byzantines regarded themselves as the true Romans, as they indeed termed themselves, and as the true successors to the Roman Empire.

## 7.5: The Sources of Josippon

- (323) ESTHER SORSCHER: A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hegesippus, and the Yosippon. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (324) KONRAD TRIEBER: Zur Kritik des Gorionides. In: Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft, phil.-hist. Classe, 1895, pp. 381–409.
- (325) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Josippon. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 53, 1962–63, pp. 277–297.



- (326) DAVID G. FLUSSER: The Author of the Book of Josippon: His Personality and His Age (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126. Rpt. in his: *Josippon: The Original MS. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements (Texts and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project)*. Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 10–27.
- (327) DAVID FLUSSER: Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 122–132.
- (328) JOHANN F. BREITHAUPT: Josephus Gorionides sive Josephus Hebraicus ... latine versus et cum exemplari Constantinopolitano collatus atque notis illustratus. Gotha 1707.
- (329) ARIEL TOAFF: La storia di Zephò e la guerra tra Angias e Turno nello Josephon. In: *Annuario di Studi Ebraici* 3, 1963–64, pp. 41–46.
- (330) GERSON D. COHEN: Esau as Symbol in Early Medieval Thought. In: ALEXANDER ALTMANN, ed., *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies* (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University: Studies and Texts, vol. 4). Cambridge, Mass. 1967. Pp. 19–48.
- (331) SARA R. DUKER: Political Ideas in the Sefer Josippon. Diss., M.A., Columbia University, New York 1969.
- (332) DAVID FLUSSER: Josippon. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 296–298.
- (333) MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER: Zur Alexandersage. In: *Hebräische Bibliographie* 9, 1869, pp. 16–19.
- (334) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: Nicolaus of Damascus. Berkeley 1962.
- (335) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: Zahab parwayim. L'or fructifère dans la tradition juive. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 13, 1963, pp. 158–186.
- (336) PIERRE GRELOT: Parwaïm des Chroniques à l'Apocryphe de la Genèse. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 11, 1961, pp. 30–38.
- (337) ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: Josippon and the Apocrypha. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 43, 1952–53, pp. 1–26. Rpt. in: ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN, *Landmarks and Goals: Historical Studies and Addresses*. Philadelphia 1953. Pp. 35–57. Trans. into Hebrew in: MOSES D. (UMBERTO) CASSUTO, JOSEPH KLAUSNER, JOSHUA GUTMANN, edd., *Sefer Asaf*. Jerusalem 1953. Pp. 391–403.
- (338) FRANK ZIMMERMANN: The Story of the Three Guardsmen. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 54, 1963–64, pp. 179–200.
- (339) JOHANNES SCHILDENBERGER, ed. and trans.: *Das Buch Esther (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments, 4 Bd., 3 Abt.)*. Bonn 1941.
- (340) CAREY A. MOORE: On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, 1973, pp. 382–393.
- (341) ARIEL TOAFF: La storia di Ester nella letteratura ebraica medievale. In: *Annuario di Studi Ebraici*, 1968–69. pp. 25–36; Appendix: La storia di Ester nello Josephon, pp. 37–45.
- (342) GERSON D. COHEN: The Story of Hannah and Her Seven Sons in Hebrew Literature. In: Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume, Hebrew Section. New York 1953. Pp. 109–122.
- (343) ALFREDO RAVENNA: I Maccabei nella letteratura talmudica. In: *Rivista Biblica* 10, 1962, pp. 384–391.
- (344) YITZHAK BAER: The Book of Josippon the Jew (in Hebrew). In: *Sefer Benzion Dinaburg*. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 178–205.
- (345) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: *Dorshé Halakot* in the Peshet Nahum Scrolls. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83, 1964, pp. 119–138.
- (346) ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: A Note on John the Baptist and Jesus in *Josippon*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23.2, 1950–51, pp. 137–149.
- (347) DAVID G. FLUSSER: An 'Alexander Geste' in a Parma Ms. (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 26, 1956–57, pp. 165–184.

- (348) LUITPOLD WALLACH: Quellenkritische Studien zum hebräischen Josippon: I: Josippon und Alexanderroman. In: Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 82, 1938, pp. 190–198.
- (348a) LUITPOLD WALLACH: Quellenkritische Studien zum hebräischen Josippon. In: Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 83, 1939 [1963], pp. 288–301. Trans. into English: Yosippon and the Alexander Romance. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 37, 1946–47, pp. 407–422.

Josippon's major source is Hegesippus. SORSCHER (323), as noted above, on the basis of a study of Book 3 of the 'War' and of the corresponding passages in Hegesippus and Josippon, concludes that Josippon omits more than Hegesippus does from the 'War' and never includes anything omitted by Hegesippus. This, we may comment, would not hold true to the same degree for the rest of Josippon, especially Book 1, but its accuracy basically remains.

It is problematic, however, despite TRIEBER (324) and ZEITLIN (325), that the author had much knowledge of patristic sources. In addition, as FLUSSER (326) (327) concludes, he had at his disposal a Latin Bible and sixteen of the twenty books of the 'Antiquities' in a Latin version.

FLUSSER (327) has located the manuscript of the Latin Josephus upon which Josippon is dependent. This manuscript bears the date 576, and FLUSSER suggests that this represents either the date when the Latin translation was made or the date when the manuscript was copied.

That the author was indeed well versed in Latin was made clear already by BREITHAUPT (328) in his references to the classical sources underlying Josippon's mythology.

TOAFF (329) notes that in some places the author betrays an attempt at translating Latin phrases into Hebrew. TOAFF also, in his commentary on the second chapter of Josippon relating the story of Zepho, the grandson of Esau, whom he, like the rabbis of the Talmud, makes one of the founders of Rome, notes parallels with Books 8, 10, and 12 of Virgil's 'Aeneid' in Josippon's account of the war between Aeneas king of Carthage (Angias in Josippon) and Turnus king of Benevento, where Josippon's Pablus = Pallas; but this would hardly prove that the author knew Virgil first-hand.

It does seem an exaggeration for COHEN (330) to assert that Josippon sets forth the essentials of Livy and Virgil from a Jewish point of view, since there is little, if anything, that can be said to go back definitely to Virgil and Livy rather than to one of the many handbooks and encyclopedias that were popular during the age and that the author may have known. The same type of source would explain the narrative of the Caesarean birth of Julius Caesar, which ZEITLIN (325) offers as proof that Josippon knew Pliny the Elder.

Josippon's genealogy of the Italian kings, as COHEN (330) rightly remarks, is uncannily accurate, and the fact that he departs from the sources known to us would indicate that he had an independent source.

DUKER's (331) thesis that Josippon was influenced by classical Christian *Romanitas* both in his theory of history and in his enumeration of the qualities of a good ruler is, we may comment, hard to prove because such ideas are too broad; and the fact that Josippon notes the common ancestry of the Romans and

Jews, mentioning a treaty between David and Romulus, may be merely in line with the historic fact, noted by Josephus (Ant. 12. 414–419), that the Maccabees formed an alliance with the Romans. In any case, we may add, the idea of a common ancestry of Romans and Jews is not an attack on the rabbinic idea of Rome as wicked, since the Jerusalem Talmud (Ta'anith 4.8, 68d) also has a tradition tracing the Romans back to Esau, the twin-brother of Jacob.

It is usually stated, for example by FLUSSER (332), that Josippon knew no Greek. The fact that, as STEINSCHNEIDER (333) remarks, Josephus is indebted to Pseudo-Callisthenes for the Alexander saga does not, of course, prove that Josippon knew Greek, since the Alexander romance was extant in Latin in many details by the tenth century.

ZEITLIN (325) argues that the author was acquainted with Josephus in Greek and that the letters in his work are taken from Josephus, with the name of the sender first (without the preposition 'from'); but, we may reply, Josippon presumably derived this format from the Latin version of Josephus.

WACHOLDER (334), pp. 11–13, argues that Josippon drew upon Nicolaus of Damascus in Greek since, like Nicolaus, he is more favorable to the Herods than Josephus himself; but, we may respond, there is no indication that Nicolaus was still extant in southern Italy in the tenth century; and, in any case, if he did know Greek he should have betrayed this in such matters as his transliteration of proper names, which he does not.

DEL MEDICO (335), disagreeing with GRELOT (336), argues that Parwayim in the Genesis Apocryphon is not a mythological region but refers to the mythical, gold-bearing tree, and that Josippon is closer to the tradition found in the Apocryphon than is his Greek original.

NEUMAN (337), comparing the accounts of Daniel and Zerubbabel in Josephus, Josippon, and the Apocrypha, concludes that Josephus, as well as the Septuagint, draw upon an earlier, more elaborate Daniel literature which is no longer extant (Josephus, Antiquities 10. 267, speaks of books that Daniel wrote), since there are differences between Josippon and the Apocrypha. He remarks that the omission of the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children from Josippon is puzzling, especially in view of the latter's preference for the kind of oratorical declamations that are contained there, and suggests that these texts were not extant in the version available to Josippon, pointing to an extremely early date for the Ur-Josippon. In the Story of the Three Pages, Josippon says that the king is strongest, whereas his source, I Esdras, says that wine is strongest; and NEUMAN concludes that this is striking evidence of the early age of Josippon. But, we may reply, all that it may indicate is that the author did not want to offend the sensibilities of the Emperor.

ZIMMERMANN (338), in his comparison of this story as found in Antiquities 11. 32–67, Josippon, and I Esdras, concludes that the original source of the story was in Aramaic and non-Jewish, since it does not mention G-d or the Torah as strongest, and that it had nothing to do with Darius but that it was referred to him in order to introduce Zerubbabel. But by such a standard, we may remark, the Book of Esther, which in the Hebrew similarly does not mention G-d or the Torah, must be of non-Jewish origin! Josippon's version

here seems to be a mixture of I Esdras and Josephus, which he apparently knew in the Latin version.

SCHILDENBERGER (339), pp. 6–7, concludes that for the story of Esther, Josippon is dependent not only on Josephus but also, since Josippon has Mordecai's dream (Addition A in the Septuagint), whereas Josephus does not, on an Aramaic appendix; but a simpler explanation, we may suggest, is that Josippon knew the Latin version, since there are other indicators that he knew the Apocrypha.

MOORE (340) suggests that Josippon derived Addition A and Addition C (the prayer of Mordecai) from the Septuagint, but we may remark that it is more likely that Josippon derived them from the Vulgate.

TOAFF (341), in his attempt to refute NEUMAN (337), suggests that many apocryphal narratives might have been preserved orally; but, we may object, this seems unlikely, since they had been committed to writing many centuries earlier. More likely Josippon knew them through Latin translations.

The fact, noted by COHEN (342) and RAVENNA (343), that Josippon is the first source in Hebrew that mentions the name of Hannah (not, to be sure, in the Mantua recension) as the mother of the seven martyrs need not lead us to conclude, as does ZEITLIN (325), that the author knew the second or fourth book of Maccabees in the original, where the name similarly occurs, but rather that he knew the Latin version.

BAER (344) contends that the author was unique in that he combined an education in the Latin language and literature with an outstanding Talmudic background, but that he sought to hide his attainments. Similarly ZEITLIN (325) says that Josippon makes extensive use of Tannaitic, yet not of Amoraic, sources (he thus records the version of the Hanukkah miracle found in the Books of Maccabees but not in the Talmud), and that Josippon even served as a source for the Talmud's version of the story of Hannah and her seven sons. But the Apocrypha, in a Latin translation, as we have suggested, would more readily explain the latter; and as to the story of the founding of Rome by Esau's descendants, as discussed by COHEN (330), this hardly need show a profound knowledge of Midrash. Thus BAER's (344) attempt to make the author into a kind of medieval Azariah dei Rossi fails, since there is little real proof in the work of Talmudic (or, according to ZEITLIN, more precisely Tannaitic) knowledge.

HOENIG (345), who adopts ZEITLIN's view that Josippon was written in the early fourth century, notes that the original Greek of Josephus does not mention the Pharisees by name in the narrative of their crucifixion by Alexander Jannaeus (War 1. 92, 197; Ant. 13. 376, 379) or, for that matter, at any time during Jannaeus' reign, whereas Josippon does; and he contends that this is evidence that Josippon had additional sources for the history of the Second Temple. This source was not Peshar Nahum, he says, since Josippon follows a traditional rather than a sectarian line. We may comment, however, that in view of the power and influence of the Pharisees with the masses of Jews as stated in Antiquities 13. 401, as even Jannaeus himself acknowledged on his deathbed, one does not have to presuppose an additional source for ur-Josippon to account for his identifying the leaders of the Jewish masses who opposed Jannaeus with the

Pharisees. As a matter of fact, Jannaeus himself admits (Ant. 13. 402) that he had come into conflict with the Jews because the Pharisees had been badly treated by him; this, we may suggest, refers to the eight hundred Jewish leaders crucified by him (Ant. 13. 380).

As to the passages on Jesus and John, NEUMAN (346) argues that the references to Jesus are spurious, but that those mentioning John are genuine, a conclusion, we might add, paralleling that of many scholars with regard to the passages concerning them in the original 'Antiquities'. As a source for the John passage, NEUMAN assumes the existence of a Jewish source common to Josephus, the New Testament, and Josippon; but this seems unlikely, since there is no indication that any such source was available to the author of Josippon at the time when the work was composed. A more likely source is Hegesippus.

The source of the Alexander-romance, which, as FLUSSER (347) shows, appears in a Parma manuscript but not in the Constantinople or Mantua versions and hence appears to be a later addition, presents a special problem. In a careful study WALLACH (348) shows that the first part of Josippon's account of Alexander is a twelfth-century interpolation in an old medieval folk-book. In a critical investigation of the second part of the Alexander romance in Josippon, WALLACH (348a) constructs a stemma indicating the relationship among the Arabic, Ethiopic, and Hebrew versions of Josippon. The German original of this latter article was to have been published in 1939; but the Nazis prevented this volume of the periodical from appearing, and it was not published until 1963.

FLUSSER (347) has noted three strands in the narrative, two of which, Pseudo-Callisthenes and a Greek history of the world from Alexander to Augustus, were already known as an interpolation in several recensions of Josippon; but the interpolator, who inserted the story no later than 1060/1, changed much of the text.

## 7.6: The Content and Outlook of Josippon

- (349) ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: Josippon: History and Pietism. In: SAUL LIEBERMAN, ed.: Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume. New York 1950. Pp. 637–667. Rpt. in: ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN, Landmarks and Goals: Historical Studies and Addresses. Philadelphia 1953. Pp. 1–34.
- (350) ESTHER SORSCHER: A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hegesippus, and the Yosippon. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (351) HIRSCH J. ZIMMELS: Aspects of Jewish Culture: Historiography. In: CECIL ROTH, ed., The World History of the Jewish People. Second Series. Vol. 2: The Dark Ages. New Brunswick, New Jersey 1966.
- (352) HANS LEWY: Josephus the Physician: A Medieval Legend of the Destruction of Jerusalem. In: Journal of the Warburg Institute 1, 1937–38, pp. 221–242. Trans. into Hebrew in his: Studies in Jewish Hellenism. Jerusalem 1960. Pp. 266–293.
- (353) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Essenes and Messianic Expectations: A Historical Study of the Sects and Ideas During the Second Jewish Commonwealth. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 45, 1954–55, pp. 83–119.

- (354) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: *Le myth des Esséniens des origines à la fin du moyen âge*. Paris 1958.
- (354a) YITZHAK BAER: *The Book of Josippon the Jew* (in Hebrew). In: *Sefer Benzion Dinaburg*. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 178–205.
- (354b) DAVID FLUSSER: *The Author of the Book of Josippon: His Personality and His Age* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126. Rpt. in his: *Josippon: The Original Version MS*. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and *Supplements* (Texts and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project). Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 10–27.
- (354c) JACOB REINER: *The Jewish War: Variations in the Historical Narratives in the Texts of Josephus and the Yosippon*. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1972.
- (354d) SAMUEL SCHAFLER: *The Hasmoneans in Jewish Historiography*. Diss., D.H.L., Jewish Theological Seminary, New York 1973.
- (354e) SHLOMO SIMONSOHN: *Afterword*. In: SALO W. BARON and GEORGE S. WISE, ed., *Violence and Defense in the Jewish Experience*. Philadelphia 1977. Pp. 337–343.

Both NEUMAN (349) and SORSCHER (350), in their comparisons of Josephus' 'War' and Josippon, conclude that whereas Josephus is, from a Jewish point of view, cold, detached, defeatist, frequently revealing a pro-Roman and anti-independence bias, Josippon is intensely and proudly Jewish, noting the struggle of the Jews to keep their land and Temple from being defiled by Gentiles and, as we have noted SORSCHER indicates, countering Hegesippus' negative attitude toward the Jews. NEUMAN goes further and contends that Josippon's religious views are more characteristically Jewish than those of Josephus; but in this conclusion, we may suggest, NEUMAN has been unduly influenced by the Hebrew terminology used by Josippon.

As a contribution to historical knowledge, the value of Josippon is slight or even negative, and, in general, as ZIMMELS (351) asserts, the effrontery of some scholars in imputing historical significance to certain passages has had little success. Occasionally Josippon introduces outright errors, as when he confuses Eleazar ben Jair, the leader of the Sicarii at Masada, with his enemy Eleazar ben Anan, and Josephus with Joseph ben Gorion.

LEWY (352), p. 227, suggests that Josippon was composed as a Jewish retort to the 'Testimonium Flavianum'.

One must beware lest one impute too much significance to Josippon's choice of terminology. Thus ZEITLIN (353) notes that where Josephus has 'Essenes' Josippon uses the term Hasidim; and he then follows CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, ZACHARIAS FRANKEL, ABRAHAM GEIGER, and KAUFMANN KOHLER in identifying the Essenes with the Hasidim.

DEL MEDICO (354) proceeds to stress that the fact that Josippon never mentions the Essenes by name is evidence for his theory that they never existed. But a simpler explanation, in our opinion, is that the choice of the term Hasidim is an attempt by the translator to arrive at a similar-sounding term in Hebrew, perhaps being aware, through his knowledge of the Apocryphal I and II Maccabees in Latin, of the group known as Hasidim, the pietists of the Maccabean period.

BAER (354a) concludes that Josippon, though dependent upon his sources, selected his material carefully and deliberately, and that therefore the work reflects the views of the author. He recognizes two opposing trends running

through Josippon, one to submit to the Romans and the other to suffer martyrdom.

FLUSSER (354b) regards Josippon as a serious historian, looks upon the work as a mere paraphrase of the 'War', and concludes that there is no basis for viewing the book as an ideological one. We may reply, however, that in his version of the Masada episode, for example, Josippon constantly stresses that the defenders were fighting for G-d, people, Temple, and Torah. As compared with Hegesippus, upon whom he is certainly dependent, however, Josippon introduced a new element, for it is only in Josippon that we find the emphasis upon the Jews fighting for religious rights. We may comment that in view of Jesus' negative attitude toward the Temple, Hegesippus, as a Christian, could hardly glorify anyone fighting for the Temple. Again, we may suggest that if we wish to see the distinctive flavor of Josippon we would do well to compare Josippon's account of the Masada episode with that of Josephus. We shall then note in Josippon both the quietistic rejection of open Messianism and a heroic precursor of the ideology of martyrdom, with an elaboration of the motif of the binding of Isaac and the enjoining of suicide by Eleazar ben Jair because the Romans would force the Jews to violate the Torah laws pertaining to sexual acts and idol worship. The fact that in the end the Masada warriors did not commit suicide according to Josippon shows that he was apparently not convinced by Eleazar's arguments; and, indeed, a case can be made that Josippon has, in effect, transposed the Masada incident temporally to the tenth century.

REINER (354c), comparing the outlook of Josippon with that of Josephus, concludes that whereas Josephus views the confrontation between the Jews and the Romans as a war for national liberty and as an attempt to eliminate Judean servitude to Rome by the use of military force, Josippon looks upon the war as a holy struggle, wherein not liberty is at stake but rather Jerusalem, the City of G-d, and the Temple, the House of G-d, together with the Judeans, the People of G-d.

SCHAFLER (354d), pp. 19–23, notes that Josippon admires and even glorifies the piety and heroism of the Hasmoneans, omitting the undertones and ambiguities that mar Josephus' account. The author was not simply a copyist but freely adapted material from Josephus and from rabbinic literature. He concludes that in his account of the subsequent history of the Hasmonean dynasty, Josippon generally follows the rabbis when they differ from Josephus.

SIMONSOHN (354e) compares the attitude toward martyrdom in Eleazar ben Jair's speech in Josephus (War 7. 323–336) and in Josippon and concludes, independently of his predecessors noted above, that whereas in the first the stress is on political independence and national pride, in the second the reference is to the true life, the world of justice, the world to come, G-d, and redemption.

## 7.7: The Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon

- (355) MEYER WAXMAN: *A History of Jewish Literature from the Close of the Bible to Our Own Days*. Vol. 1. New York 1930. Pp. 423–425. 2nd ed., New York 1938, pp. 419–421.

- (356) MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER: *Die Arabische Literatur der Juden: Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der Araber, grossenteils aus handschriftlichen Quellen.* Frankfurt 1902. P. 114.
- (357) MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER: *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century.* London 1857.
- (358) JULIUS WELLHAUSEN: *Der arabische Josippus (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Folge 1, Nr. 4).* Berlin 1897.
- (359) GEORG GRAF: *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur.* Vol. I. Vatican City 1944.
- (360) M. SANDERS and H. M. NAHMAD: *A Judeo-Arabic Epitome of the Yosippon.* In: *Essays in Honor of Solomon B. Freehof.* Pittsburgh, Pa. 1964. Pp. 275–299.
- (361) LAZARUS GOLDSCHMIDT: *Die abessinischen Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek zu Frankfurt am Main (Rüppell'sche Sammlung).* Berlin 1897.
- (362) MURAD KAMIL, ed.: *Des Josef Ben Gorion (Josippon) Geschichte der Juden (Zēna Aihūd) nach den Handschriften herausgegeben.* Diss., Tübingen 1937. Glückstadt–Hamburg–New York 1938.
- (363) AARON Z. AEŠCOLY, rev.: MURAD KAMIL, *Des Josef Ben Gorion (Josippon) Geschichte der Juden.* In: *Revue des Études juives* 104, 1938, pp. 133–138.
- (364) JEAN SIMON, rev.: MURAD KAMIL, *Des Josef Ben Gorion (Josippon) Geschichte der Juden.* In: *Orientalia* 9, 1940, pp. 378–387.

In view of the tremendous interest in Josippon it is surprising that the version in Arabic, which was made from the Hebrew in the tenth century (the Arabic writer Ibn Hazam, as WAXMAN [355] notes, who died in 1063, already quotes a long excerpt from it) by Zakariya ibn Saʿīd (see STEINSCHNEIDER [356] [357]), and which should, therefore, be of considerable value for reconstructing the text of the original Josippon, has still not been scientifically edited.

WELLHAUSEN's (358) version is merely an abridged translation into German of an inferior fourteenth-century manuscript. GRAF (359) lists the manuscripts and editions. SANDERS and NAHMAD (360) give the text and translation of a fragment of eight leaves of a manuscript dating from the twelfth century relating in epitome form the story of the last days of Herod to the destruction of the Temple and including the incident of John the Baptist.

Some time between the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries the Arabic version was, in turn, translated very literally into Ethiopic. One of the manuscripts was described by GOLDSCHMIDT (361), but it was not until KAMIL (362) that we were given a modern, critical edition, based upon all twelve of the known manuscripts, carefully collated, according to the reviews of AEŠCOLY (363) and SIMON (364), with the Arabic text.



## 8: Josephus' Life

### 8.0: Josephus' Life: General

- (365) ALFRED EDERSHEIM: Josephus. In: WILLIAM SMITH and HENRY WACE, edd., *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*. Vol. 3, London 1882, pp. 441–460.
- (366) JACOB HAMBURGER: Josephus Flavius. In: JACOB HAMBURGER, ed., *Real-Encyklopädie für Bibel und Talmud*. Abteilung 2. Strelitz 1883. Pp. 502–510.
- (367) JACOB ZLOTNIK: Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 13, 1949–50, pp. 19–35, 185–193.
- (368) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe*. 2 vols. Paris 1952.
- (369) THOMAS W. AFRICA: *Rome of the Caesars*. New York 1965. Pp. 101–121: 'The Jew – Josephus'.
- (370) ARON ALKALAJ: Josif Flavija i pad Judeje. In: *Jevrejski Almanah* 1963–64. Beograd 1965. Pp. 35–55.
- (371) F. SEN: Una época agitada y difícil. Flavio Josefo: personaje contradictorio. In: *Cultura Biblica* 29, 1972, pp. 289–291.
- (371a) OLIVER COBURN: *Flavius Josephus: The Jew Who Rendered unto Caesar*. London 1972.
- (371b) ISAAC H. HERZOG: Something on Josephus (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 25, 1949, pp. 8–11.
- (371c) SAM WAAGENAAR: *The Pope's Jews* (revised trans. of *Il Ghetto sul Tevere*). LaSalle, Illinois 1974.
- (371d) DAVID DAUBE: *Typologie im Werk des Flavius Josephus* (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, Jahrgang 1977, Heft 6). München 1977. Rpt. in: *Freiburger Rundbrief* 31, 1979, pp. 59–69. Trans. into English: *Typology in Josephus*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31, 1980, pp. 18–36.
- (371e) URIEL RAPPAPORT: Josephus Flavius: Notes on His Personality and His Work (in Hebrew). In: *Ha-Ummah* 15, 1977, pp. 89–95.

Few scholars have been neutral in their judgment of the life of Josephus. In the nineteenth century, as EDERSHEIM (365), p. 441, has noted, there was an almost unanimous condemnation of him by Jews and Christians alike, a major exception being the Jewish scholar HAMBURGER (366), who regarded Josephus' own steadfast adherence to Judaism and his able literary defence of its tenets as providing sufficient ground for pardoning his supposed wrongs to the Jewish people.

Among more general treatments of Josephus' life ZLOTNIK (367) must surely count as one of the least satisfactory. The survey is at second hand and contains such extravagant statements as that Bannus, Josephus' teacher, was a Christian because he engaged in frequent ablutions, that Josephus himself was not a Pharisee but a Jewish Christian, and that Josephus does not say a single word about the Oral Torah (this despite Josephus' statement [Ant. 13. 297] that

the Pharisees, in contrast to the Sadducees, accept both the written and Oral Torah).

ABEL (368), vol. 1, pp. 474–500, has an extensive survey of Josephus' career, but it is largely an uncritical summary of Josephus' own words.

AFRICA (369) presents a popular biography of Josephus, defending him as a sincere Jew, though he was not a man of heroic character, and comparing him with the prophet Jeremiah, who had suffered abuse for opposing the revolt to free Jerusalem from the Babylonians; but such comparisons, we may comment, fail to note that not only did Josephus oppose the revolt but that he joined the revolutionaries' opponents and received rewards from them. Africa's study is of interest for its frequent comparisons with present-day terrorists.

I am not able to read ALKALAJ'S (370) popular survey in Serbian of Josephus' life and character. SEN (371) has a brief biography of Josephus and comments on recent literature about him. COBURN (371a) has a popular history of the Jewish war, in which he concludes that Josephus, after basely saving his life, redeemed his honor as a good Jew by writing a history which would put the Jews in the best possible light.

HERZOG (371b) concludes that Josephus' general place in Jewish history is not entirely negative, since if not for him we would not have a history of his period and since we must be grateful to him for his defense of Judaism in 'Against Apion'. Yet his faith, says HERZOG, was not pure; for a believing Jew would not have had such close contact with the philosophers of his generation. We may, however, comment that Josephus does not mention any contact with philosophers by name (he mentions Philo in connection with the latter's political activities); and no contemporary philosopher ever mentions him.

WAAGENAAR (371c), pp. 2–8, presents a brief, romanticized biography of Josephus.

DAUBE (371d) comments suggestively on Josephus' self-identification with Jeremiah (who was similarly a prophet who suffered at the hands of his fellow-Jews), Joseph (who was similarly falsely accused), Daniel, Esther, and Mordecai.

RAPPAPORT (371e) presents a psychological analysis of Josephus as a study in the contradictions between the ideal self and the real self – the courageous coward, the unrecognized wise man, the patriotic traitor, and the stumbling Thucydides.

### 8.1: Sources for Josephus' Life

- (372) JACOB ZLOTNIK: Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: Sinai 13, 1949–50, pp. 19–35, 185–193.
- (373) NEHEMIAH BRÜLL: Eine talmudische Nachricht über Josephus. In: Jahrbücher für Jüdische Geschichte und Literatur 4, 1879, pp. 40–42.
- (374) HAYIM LESHEM: Flavius on the Antiquity of the Jews Compared with the Greeks (in Hebrew). In: Maḥanaim, 112, 1967, pp. 92–95.
- (375) ERNEST WIESENBERG: Related Prohibitions: Swine Breeding and the Study of Greek. In: Hebrew Union College Annual 27, 1956, pp. 213–233.

- (376) ERNEST PAWEL, rev.: GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON, *The World of Josephus*. In: *Judaism* 14, 1965, pp. 367–373.
- (376a) HORST R. MOEHRING: Letter to the Editor. In: *Judaism* 15, 1966, pp. 226–228.
- (376b) ISAAC H. HERZOG: Something on Josephus (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 25, 1949, pp. 8–11.
- (376c) BEN ZION DINUR: The Historiographical Fragments in Talmudic Literature and Their Investigation (in Hebrew). In: *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (1969), vol. 2, Jerusalem 1972, pp. 137–146.

Aside from Josephus' own autobiography and references to his career in the 'War', the only ancient references to him are in Suetonius at the beginning of the second century, who mentions him (Vespasian 5. 6) as one of the high-born Jewish captives but not as a general, who had predicted upon being put into chains that he would soon be released (a detail not in Josephus) by Vespasian, who would in the meantime become Emperor; Appian in the middle of the second century, who (fragment 17, p. 534, in PAUL VIERECK and ANTON G. ROOS, edd., *Appian, Historia Romana*, Leipzig 1962) mentions this oracle in the twenty-second book of his Roman history; Dio Cassius at the beginning of the third century, who notes (66. 1) that Josephus, when captured, had predicted that within a year (again a detail at variance with Josephus, according to whom he was released two years after his capture), Vespasian, having become emperor, would release him; and Porphyry (*De Abstinencia ab Esu Animalium* 4. 11), who remarks that the three philosophic schools – Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes – had often been described by Josephus, notably in the second book of his Jewish history (not the title of the 'War' in our manuscripts), in the eighteenth of the 'Archaeology', and the second of the 'Against the Greeks' (not the title of 'Against Apion' in our manuscripts), though the last in the extant manuscripts never refers to the Essenes.

One question that has intrigued several scholars is why Josephus is not mentioned anywhere in the huge Talmudic corpus. ZLOTNIK (372) suggests that it is because Josephus was an 'outsider'. Similar questions, we may remark, have been raised about the Talmud's silence concerning the philosopher Philo, and concerning the leaders of the Jewish revolt, Simon bar Giora, John of Gischala, and Eleazar ben Simon, as well as concerning the celebrated mass suicide at Masada. It may be here suggested that the reason for this silence – and it is mutual on the part of both Philo and Josephus, since Philo never mentions any of the Talmudic sages by name, and Josephus is silent about such major figures as Hillel (unless he be the Pollio of *Antiquities* 15. 3–4, 370) and Johanan ben Zakkai – is that the Talmud is not a history or philosophy book. Still, the Talmud does occasionally mention such historical figures as Herod and Titus; and if indeed Josephus was of such distinguished ancestry and achievements as he claims to be, one might expect an occasional mention by the Talmudic sages.

BRÜLL (373) and LESHEM (374) attempt to find a hidden reference to Josephus in a minor Talmudic tractate, *Derekh Erez Rabbah* 5 (*Pirke Ben Azzai* 3, ed. HIGGER, p. 183), which notes that when the four great sages, Joshua ben Ḥananiah, Akiva, Gamaliel, and Eleazar ben Azariah, went to Rome toward the end of Domitian's reign to protest Domitian's decision to kill all the Jews in the Roman Empire, they visited a nameless philosopher. In view of the fact that, so

far as we know, Josephus was the one Jew in Rome who continued to have influence with Domitian, being an adopted Flavian, it would seem reasonable for the envoys to call upon him for his aid. Psychologically, we may add, Josephus was eager, because of the many accusations against him, to prove his loyalty to the Jewish people, as he did in his last written works, notably the 'Antiquities' and, especially, 'Against Apion'. According to the Talmudic text, before visiting the philosopher, Joshua, who was known for his colloquies with such thinkers, asked Gamaliel whether they should visit him, and Gamaliel at first objected. This reply should, we may add, be understood against the background of the fact that Gamaliel's father had attempted to recall Josephus from his command in Galilee. The suggestion, then, to identify the philosopher as Josephus would seem to have some plausibility, except for the fact that Josephus is not presented in his own extant writings as a philosopher and that the philosopher in the Talmudic story is a pagan.

Less appealing is the suggestion, which WIESENBERG (375) makes with some diffidence, identifying Josephus as the old man (Babylonian Talmud: Baba Kamma 82b, Sotah 49b, Menahot 64b) who was learned in Greek wisdom and who gave the advice to send up a swine instead of cattle for the sacrifices in the Temple during the civil war between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. The term "old man" (*zaken*), we may remark, is, as we see in the Talmud (Kiddushin 32b), a synonym for a wise man; but this incident occurred in 63 B.C.E., a full century before the birth of Josephus (unless we follow the Palestinian Talmud in placing it in the time of Titus); and there is no particular reason for identifying the old man as Josephus except for his Greek learning, which, despite Josephus' own statement (Ant. 20. 263) praising his knowledge in this field, was hardly restricted to Josephus.

Still less appealing is the hypothesis of LESHEM (314) that Josephus is the priest, Joseph the pious, mentioned in the Mishnah (Mikva'oth 10. 1) and Tosefta (Shabbath 13. 13) as a notable scribe; in the latter place, it is said that Joseph was so pious in observing the Sabbath that he did not send his letters via a Gentile even on Wednesday and Thursday lest they arrive on the Sabbath. But the name Joseph is, of course, we may remark, extremely common; and though none of his opponents apparently charged Josephus with impiety, neither does Josephus boast, as is his wont in general, of his piety.

But even if the references in the Talmud are indeed to Josephus, for practical purposes we are left only with Josephus' own remarks about his career as a source of our knowledge of his life. Josephus' 'Life' will be discussed elsewhere, but we may note the distinction made by Polybius (10. 21) between biographical encomium and historical narrative, where he notes that he had already in the biography of Philopoemen described his achievements with exaggeration as required by a panegyric, but that in a history the same matters must be treated in detail and in a different manner, since the aim of history is not to praise but to present a true account of events with particular attention to cause and effect. The same differentiation between history and a biographical monograph may be seen described in Cicero's letter to Lucceius (Ad Familiares 5. 12). Autobiography was still less reliable as a source of fact, as we may infer

from Tacitus' remark (Agricola 1): "Many, too, thought that to write their own lives showed the confidence of integrity rather than presumption." The autobiography of Josephus is, after all, a spirited defense against his enemies, and thus clearly suspect. The fact that where we can compare his remarks in the 'Life' with the 'War' written almost two decades earlier there are sometimes discrepancies (though these have been exaggerated) has led to still further suspicions of the truth of the remarks in the former. There may be some psychological truth, however, in the insight provided by PAWEL (376) that Josephus' work is the first extant record of a modern Jew trying to come to terms with his fate by transmuting guilt and impotence into words, and that he is the first Jewish writer to expose himself to his public, "often unwittingly, sometimes courageously, never with grace."

MOEHRING (376a) defends Josephus against PAWEL (376). He stresses that Josephus sincerely believed that the future of Israel lay within the Roman Empire and was highly suspicious of any supernatural claims of any messiah put forth by the rebels. PAWEL replies immediately after this letter. We may suggest that there are overtones in this debate that relate to the contemporary state of Israel and to its *raison d'être*.

HERZOG (376b) concludes that Josephus is not mentioned in the Talmud because he was not great in knowledge of the Torah and because he was suspected of treachery. He disagrees with the view that Josephus is the philosopher visited by the four great sages (Derekh Erez Rabbah 5). This philosopher, HERZOG plausibly concludes, was one of the righteous gentiles.

DINUR (376c) accepts the view that the philosopher in Derekh Erez Rabbah 5 and Kallah 6 is Josephus and suggests that the Hebrew word *philosophos* is really Flavius Josephus (in Hebrew the spellings are remarkably similar).

## 8.2: Josephus' Family, Education, and Early Life

- (377) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the *Sefer Ha-Kabbalah* with Special Emphasis on Josephus. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 59, 1968–69, pp. 171–214; 60, 1969–70, pp. 37–68, 375–406.
- (378) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu. Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte. Leipzig 1923; 3rd ed., Göttingen 1962. Trans. into French (based on 3rd ed.) by JEAN LEMOYNE: Jérusalem au temps de Jésus, recherches d'histoire économique et sociale pour la période néotestamentaire. Paris 1967. Trans. into English (based on 3rd ed.) by F. H. and C. H. CAVE: Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus; An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period. Philadelphia 1969.
- (379) AHARON KAMINKA: Critical Writings (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (380) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.: Flavius Josephus: Selections from His Works. New York 1974.
- (381) LUDWIG RADERMACHER: Christus unter den Schriftgelehrten. In: Rheinisches Museum 73, 1920–24, pp. 232–239.
- (382) ALFRED EDERSHEIM: Josephus. In: WILLIAM SMITH and HENRY WACE, edd., A Dictionary of Christian Biography 3, London 1882, pp. 441–460.
- (383) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: Studies in Josephus. London 1961.

- (384) ALFRED ADAM: *Antike Berichte über die Essener*. Berlin 1961. Rev. ed. by CHRISTOPH BURCHARD. Berlin 1972.
- (385) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD, rev.: ALFRED ADAM, *Antike Berichte über die Essener*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 5, 1964–66, p. 133.
- (385a) MARIE-JOSEPH LAGRANGE: *L'Évangile de Jésus-Christ. Avec la synopse évangélique traduite par le p. C. LAVERGNE*. New ed., Paris 1954. Trans. into English by LUKE WALKER and REGINALD GINNS: *The Gospel of Jesus Christ*. 2 vols. Westminster, Maryland 1938. Trans. into German: *Das Evangelium von Jesus Christus*. Heidelberg 1949.
- (385b) LÉON HERRMANN: *Chrestos: Témoignages païens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle*. Brussels 1970.
- (385c) LÉON HERRMANN: *Bannoun ou Iouannoun. Felix ou Festus? (Flavius Josèphe, Vie, 11 et 13)*. In: *Revue des Études juives* 135, 1976, pp. 151–155.
- (385d) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: *Paul et l'antiféminisme*. In: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 60, 1976, pp. 261–280.
- (385e) OTTO BETZ: *Paulus als Pharisäer nach dem Gesetz*. Phil. 3, 5–6 als Beitrag zur Frage des frühen Pharisäismus. In: *Veröffentlichungen aus dem Institut Kirche und Judentum bei der kirchlichen Hochschule Berlin*, vol. 3 (= *Treue zur Thora: Beiträge zur Mitte des christlich-jüdischen Gesprächs: Festschrift für Günther Harder zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. PETER VON DER OSTEN-SACKEN. Berlin 1977. Pp. 54–64.

ZEITLIN (377), noting that Josephus tells us (Life 2) that he was related on both his parents' sides to the first of the twenty-four courses of priests, and on his mother's side to the royal Hasmoneans, conjectures that Josephus cherished the hope of some day becoming not only high priest but also king of Judaea. This is, of course, possible in view of Josephus' enormous pride and ambition; but, we may comment, there is no direct evidence of such hopes in any of his works; and one would think that his opponents, seeking to discredit him, would have accused him of such excessive ambitions; but he nowhere answers such a charge. On the contrary, there had been detractors of his family (Life 6), and this is the reason given by Josephus for presenting his genealogy.

JEREMIAS (378), commenting on the account which Josephus gives of his genealogy, asserts that Josephus has several inaccuracies, which may be explained by the hypothesis that he omitted two names. According to Josephus' data, his ancestor Matthias the Hump-back became the father of a son Joseph when he was sixty-eight years old, and the latter, in turn, was seventy-three when he became the father of Matthias, the father of Josephus. SCHÜRER had suggested that there was a textual corruption; but the manuscripts are unanimous at this point, and we know that during the period of the Second Temple priests, among whom Josephus was numbered, were restricted in marriage to those families whose purity of blood was beyond cavil, and they therefore had to know both their own genealogy and that of the families into whom they were marrying (Against Apion 1. 30–31). Josephus says, moreover, that his own genealogy was to be found recorded in the public registers (Life 6).

We know nothing of Josephus' early life until the age of fourteen; but KAMINKA (379), pp. 75–79, notes that when Josephus was ten Tiberius Julius Alexander was appointed procurator of Judaea, that Josephus certainly met with him, and that the precedent of a renegade Jew must have made a lasting impression upon him. But, we may reply, there is no indication in Josephus'

works that he had met Tiberius Julius Alexander; and to judge from his strong remarks about attachment to Jewish laws (e.g., *Against Apion* 2. 278) he must have condemned such an apostasy. In any case, if indeed Josephus had found a precedent for collaboration with the Romans in Tiberius Alexander, his enemies, who were quick to pick up any possible charge against him, did not note it.

Josephus (*Life* 8) tells us that he made such great progress in his education, gaining a reputation for memory and understanding (σύνεσις) that at the age of fourteen the chief priests and leaders of the city of Jerusalem constantly resorted to him for information concerning the laws. WASSERSTEIN (380) follows RADEMACHER (381) in noting the parallel in Luke 2. 46–47 in the case of Jesus, who, at the age of twelve (the only detail about Jesus' early life between his infancy and his ministry recorded in the Gospels), was found by his parents in the Temple sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions. There, too, those who heard him were amazed at his understanding (συνέσει). One is tempted to regard this as a traditional motif in biographies, since we find similar precocity in Moses, Homer, Aeschines, Alexander the Great, Apollonius of Rhodes, Augustus, Ovid, Nicolaus of Damascus, and Apollonius of Tyana. Though Joshua ben Gamla (*Baba Bathra* 21a) had introduced a regulation that teachers be appointed in each town and that children begin their schooling at the age of six or seven, the study of the Talmud, at least in the middle of the second century, to judge from the saying of Judah ben Tema (*Avoth* 5. 21), was not normally begun until the age of fifteen.

In a difficult passage (*Life* 10–12) Josephus says that at about the age of sixteen he decided to gain experience (ἐμπειρίαν) in the three sects in order to select the best. And so, he says, submitting himself to hardy training and much toil, he went through the three. Such a procedure is a common motif in this period, as we see in the cases of Nicolaus of Damascus, Apollonius of Tyana, Justin, and Galen, and may therefore not correspond to reality. It is clear from the choice of the word ἐμπειρία, which indicates practical rather than theoretical experience, that Josephus would have us believe that he did not merely study the theories of the three groups. Moreover, to judge from what Josephus says elsewhere about his mental agility, at the age of fourteen mental activity was no toil for him. Despite SCHÜRER, as EDERSHEIM (382), p. 442, remarks, there were no academies of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes for him to pass through: it was a matter of practical experience. But there is some confusion in the text, because Josephus proceeds to say that, not being content with the experience, he became a devoted disciple of a certain hermit named Bannus for three years. He was now, he says, in his nineteenth year; but since he spent three years with Bannus, this would leave no time for the three sects. One solution for this apparently impossible chronology is to state that the motif of studying in various philosophical schools is a commonplace and need not be taken literally. SHUTT (383), p. 2, n. 3, suggests reading παρ' αὐτοῖς, i.e., with the three sects and Bannus in *Life* 12, for παρ' αὐτῷ (with him, i.e. Bannus). But this emendation, we may suggest, is not really necessary if we realize that Josephus had probably already lived as either a Pharisee or Sadducee (the priests, of which he was one, were particularly prominent in the latter movement) before the age of sixteen, and

since these two groups were bitter opponents of one another he presumably knew the views of his opponents well; he would, therefore, need only a few months to practice their views systematically. He would thus have spent the greater part of these three years with the Essenes, to whom Bannus bore a close relationship, since he did not know them firsthand. We may here add that, despite the common view that Bannus was an Essene, Josephus distinguishes between him and the Essenes, since he states that he studied first with the three sects and then with Bannus.

The name Bannus, otherwise unknown, has occasioned a suggestion from ADAM (384), p. 37, that it is the Aramaic form of βαλνεύς (i.e. βαλανεύς), "bath-man," presumably alluding to his propensity (Life 11) for ablutions. BURCHARD (385) objects that if so it would be a name of derision and asks why Bannus a Jew would have a Greek nickname. But this word, we may add, is frequently found in the Talmud (e.g. Mishnah Shevi'ith 8. 5; Jerusalem Talmud Baba Bathra 4. 14c) as *balan*, i.e. "bathing-master," "bathing attendant," and is clearly no longer regarded as merely a Greek word. Moreover, the name Pharisees, if it means "Separatists," is also a name given by their opponents.

We may also ask why after trying all the schools Josephus finally chose to join the Pharisees rather than the Sadducees, with whom men of his priestly rank, glorious ancestry, and conservative bent would have seemed to have more in common. Josephus does not help us in this matter, but one may perhaps be forgiven for guessing that he calculated that a man with his ambition could get further in the Pharisaic ranks, since, as Josephus says (Antiquities 18. 15), they were more influential among the townsfolk than the Sadducees and since even the Sadducees had to submit to their formulae, inasmuch as otherwise the masses would not tolerate them at all (Antiquities 18. 17). If Josephus were to choose an American political party in 1976, he would probably similarly calculate that he had more to gain after Watergate by becoming a Democrat than by staying within his conservative family Republican tradition.

We may be intrigued by what Josephus did between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six or twenty-seven, but Josephus tells us nothing. In 64, however, he says (Life 13) that he went to Rome (there is no statement as to who sent him) to help deliver some priestly friends from bondage. EDERSHEIM (382) tries to connect the liberation of the priests with the liberation of Paul, who, like Josephus, had suffered shipwreck en route when he had been sent for trial a few years earlier by the procurator Festus; but, we may comment, there is no evidence, even in Christian legend, linking Paul and Josephus, though one might suspect that their opponents, who were numerous for both of them, might have tried to link them. Josephus was successful, thanks to the aid of a Jewish actor at court named Aliturus and of Nero's mistress Poppaea Sabina, who was a 'sympathizer' with Judaism (Antiquities 20. 195). In addition to the release of the captives Josephus also received some gifts, and one wonders whether there was not some connection between the extraordinary success of the young man and a promise, explicit or implicit, to defuse the incipient revolution once he would return to Jerusalem. Of course, the gifts may have been merely part of the hospitality shown him; but the mention of these gifts would be self-incriminat-



ing; and we may conjecture that Josephus was forced to admit that he had indeed received them. In any case, the visit must have had a considerable impact on Josephus, impressing him with the might of Rome; and the next thing that we hear about is that Josephus, while pointing out the might of Rome and the futility of revolt, was forced to take refuge in the Temple precincts.

LAGRANGE (385a), p. 52, comments briefly on the learning of the boy Josephus (Life 9).

HERRMANN (385b) explains Josephus' silence concerning the end of his relations with Bannus as due to Bannus' association with a nationalistic movement similar to others mentioned by Josephus; but, we may comment, Josephus never as much as hints at such a connection.

HERRMANN (385c) remarks on the relationship, often noted, between the precocity of Josephus (Life 9) and that of Jesus (Luke 2. 41–47). He suggests that the name Bannoun (Life 11) is an error for Iōannoun, the accusative of Iōannēs, and that the reference is to John the son of John, who is mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 20. 14) as one of the bearers of the Emperor Claudius' letter to the Jews allowing them to keep the high priests' vestments and who was the author of 'Revelation' and 'Hebrews'. He argues that the name of the Roman governor at the time when Josephus went to redeem the Jewish priestly captives was Festus, not Felix (Life 13). We may remark that HERRMANN's theories are hard to accept. In the first place, to say, because of similarity of language, that Josephus was inspired by some account of the youth of Jesus or that Luke was inspired by the account of Josephus' youth is to ignore the fact that such a motif was a commonplace and that there are only two phrases which are in common. Secondly, the accusative of Ἰωάννης is Ἰωάννην, not Ἰωάννου. Thirdly, there is nothing further known from Josephus or from any other source about John the son of John that would identify him with the author of 'Revelation' and of 'Hebrews'. There is considerable doubt whether any man named John, let alone John the son of John, composed 'Revelation', despite the universal tradition that the author was the disciple St. John. As to 'Hebrews', it is traditionally ascribed to Paul; and while his authorship is doubted, there is no evidence that the real author was John the son of John, who is mentioned only once by Josephus. In any case, the John of the New Testament was the son of Zebedee. As to the name of the procurator at the time when Josephus went on his mission to Rome, all manuscripts are unanimous in reading Felix (Φῆλιξ or Φίλιξ or Φίληξ), and the transcriptional probability of an error in so many letters is small. It is likewise extravagant for HERRMANN to state that Josephus, in Antiquities 18. 81–84, is accusing Paul of having caused the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Tiberius, since Josephus does not mention Paul by name and since the incident apparently took place during the reign of Tiberius in 19 C.E. (see Tacitus, Annals 2. 85); it thus seems hard to believe, inasmuch as he was not active until a later period (the incident of his conversion on the road to Damascus took place in 35).

DUBARLE (385d) notes that Josephus, like Paul, pays comparatively little attention to women, but that this is in line with the style of the time, as we may see in a number of other ancient authors, such as Cicero, Seneca the Younger,

and Pliny the Younger. We may add that Josephus does not give the name of even his mother. DUBARLE interestingly notes a number of resemblances between the lives of Paul and Josephus.

BETZ (385e) comments on the importance of genealogy, as seen in Josephus (Life 1ff.), in Paul, and in the Talmud.

### 8.3: Josephus' Appointment as Military General in Galilee

- (386) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage.* Giessen 1920.
- (387) BACCHISTO MOTZO: *Saggi di storia e letteratura giudeo-ellenistica.* Firenze 1924.
- (388) MATTHIAS GELZER: *Die Vita des Josephos.* In: *Hermes* 80, 1952, pp. 67–90; rpt. in his: *Kleine Schriften* 3. Wiesbaden 1964. Pp. 299–325.
- (389) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the Sefer Ha-Kabbalah with Special Emphasis on Josephus.* In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 59, 1968–69, pp. 171–214; 60, 1969–70, pp. 37–68, 375–406.
- (390) AHARON KAMINKA: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (391) YITZHAK BAER: *Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.
- (392) YITZHAK ISAAC HALEVY (RABINOWITZ): *Dorot Ha-rishonim (= Generations of Old)* (in Hebrew). Vol. 4, part 1, ed. MOSHE AUERBACH: *The Last Period of the Second Temple: the Period of the Roman Procurators and the War.* Benei Beraq 1964.
- (393) TESSA RAJAK: *Justus of Tiberias.* In: *Classical Quarterly* 23, 1973, pp. 345–368.
- (394) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian.* New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (395) MOSES ABERBACH: *The Roman-Jewish War (66–70 A.D.): Its Origin and Consequences.* London 1966.
- (396) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Josephus Flavius.* In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (397) REINHOLD MAYER and CHRISTA MÖLLER: *Josephus – Politiker und Prophet.* In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet.* Göttingen 1974. Pp. 271–284.
- (398) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian.* Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (398a) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *New Testament History.* London 1969; New York 1971.
- (398b) FRANCIS LOFTUS: *The Anti-Roman Revolts of the Jews and the Galileans.* In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 68, 1977–78, pp. 78–98.

According to the War 2. 562–568, the revolutionaries, after their rout of the Roman governor of Syria Cestius Gallus, brought over to their side, partly by persuasion and partly by force, such pro-Romans as still remained. Thereafter they proceeded to appoint additional generals, including a number of priests, to conduct the war. Among these was Josephus, who was put in charge of Upper and Lower Galilee.

According to Josephus' autobiography (Life 17), which tells the story at greater length, when he returned from Rome, he tried without success to suppress the revolutionary movements, reminding the revolutionaries of their

inferiority to the Romans both in military skill and in good luck. To escape the extremists he sought asylum in the inner court of the Temple, emerging only after the death of the chiefs of the rebels. Josephus then, in concert with the chief priests and leading Pharisees, pretended to agree with the views of the revolutionaries, urging war only in self-defense, while actually hoping that Cestius Gallus would in the meantime quell the revolution. Inasmuch as the whole of Galilee, a hotbed of revolution since the days of Judas and his clan, had not yet revolted, the leaders in Jerusalem, who favored pacification, dispatched Josephus (Life 28), together with two other priests, to induce the terrorists to fight only in self-defense.

The comparison of these accounts has commanded the attention of a number of scholars, notably LAQUEUR (386), pp. 56–96; MOTZO (387), pp. 214–240; and GELZER (388). They see blatant contradictions between the two versions, particularly in the fact that in the 'War' Josephus is appointed to conduct war, whereas in the 'Life' he is appointed to pacify the inhabitants. The question then becomes which account to believe. GELZER (388), who has the last extended discussion of this topic, and ZEITLIN (389) place greater credence in the 'Life', arguing that in the earlier 'War' Josephus gave the official version of the government in Jerusalem, whereas in the later 'Life', when he was under no pressure, he presented the actual facts. KAMINKA (390), pp. 66–75, stresses that since the 'Life' was written at the end of his life when he was famous and honored, it is more reliable, inasmuch as Josephus could now afford to tell the truth about his younger days; but, in rebuttal, we must note that since Josephus was there defending himself against the serious charges of Justus he had to be more wary than ever. He says that since Agrippa and his army had strengthened the hand of Vespasian in Galilee, it is impossible to conceive that Josephus or anyone else for that matter could have had much of an opportunity to do anything militarily and that hence Josephus was sent as a priest rather than as a general; but a major point of Josephus' account in the 'War' is that the revolutionaries had forced the rest of the Jews, including moderates such as himself, into opposition against the Romans upon pain of death. BAER (391) asserts that in the 'Life' Josephus used his original notes, but that in the 'War' he rendered the same material in a distorted fashion. There is, however, no evidence for such an hypothesis in the works themselves.

One wonders how much one can trust an account that is so clearly apologetic as the 'Life'. HALEVY (392), pp. 93–96, says that the account of his selection as general in Galilee and of his deeds there is merely boastful to increase his worth in the eyes of Vespasian and Titus, but that when Vespasian and Titus were no longer alive, there was no longer a need to write what many people knew was incorrect.

RAJAK (393) suggests that the inconsistencies between the two accounts have been overstressed, that the 'War' is a formal account inevitably more compressed, and that the supplementary data, showing that Josephus had obeyed orders and had maintained an anti-war policy as long as possible, have been added to the 'Life' in order to rebut the arguments of Josephus' opponent Justus of Tiberias.

We may here suggest that the versions are not necessarily contradictory but rather represent two stages in Josephus' activities. It is apparent from Life 116ff. that when Josephus saw that pacification did not work he assumed command of Galilee and fought the Romans.

The question has often been asked as to why someone so young (Josephus was not yet thirty) and so inexperienced (there is no indication that he had had any previous military experience) should have been chosen as commander in the area where the Romans were most likely to attack first. LAQUEUR (386) thought that it was because of the success of his mission to Rome in freeing the priests; but, as THACKERAY (394), pp. 20–21, notes, there is no apparent connection between the missions, and, indeed, there was an interval of two years between them. KAMINKA (390), noting that Suetonius mentions Josephus as one of the most important captives but not as a general, suggests that Josephus was actually not a general at all. But in this respect there is no discrepancy between the 'War' and the 'Life', and it seems hardly likely that there would have been such an animus against Josephus unless he had indeed played an important, if ignominious, role in the war. Moreover, in answer to the charges of his opponents, he nowhere sees the need to refute a possible charge that he had exaggerated his role in Galilee.

There is no indication that the other 'generals' appointed by the leaders in Jerusalem had any more military experience than Josephus. It may well be, as ABERBACH (395) suggests, that the Jewish leaders' main concern was to establish their authority through the appointment of trusted administrators and that they deliberately avoided appointing able and experienced generals since their main aim was not to pursue the war but to seek a reconciliation of the various factions of the Jews with one another, with Agrippa, and with the Romans.

Finally, SCHALIT (396) correctly concludes that there is no justification for the theory that Josephus was never sent to Galilee but that he seized control there against the wishes of the Sanhedrin even before the outbreak of the revolt. If this were so, we may add, Justus and his other opponents would surely have seized upon it.

MAYER and MÖLLER (397) repeat the usual version that the war was begun by extremists and that after the defeat of Cestius the 'moderates', including Ananus and Josephus, came into control. This picture has been most recently challenged by COHEN (398), who, in general, assumes a hypercritical attitude toward Josephus' account.

BRUCE (398a), pp. 360ff., explains the discrepancy between War 2. 568 and Life 17ff., by saying that in the former the exaggeration of his insurgent zeal as general enhanced the magnanimity of Vespasian and of Titus, whereas in the latter, where he emphasizes his pro-Roman stand, it was more important to allay Domitian's anti-Jewish suspicions.

LOFTUS (398b) suggests that Josephus was chosen commander in Galilee because the Galileans, having been brought back into the Jewish state by the Hasmoneans, were pro-Hasmonean, and Josephus was of Hasmonean stock and thus, it was hoped, would be able to generate popular support. We may how-

ever, comment that Josephus was opposed to the revolt and encountered much opposition in Galilee, especially from John of Gischala.

#### 8.4: Josephus' Conduct as Military General in Galilee

- (399) AHARON KAMINKA: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (400) EMIL SCHÜRER: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 vols. 3rd and 4th ed. Leipzig 1901–1909.
- (401) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (402) NORMAN BENTWICH: *Josephus*. Philadelphia 1914. Rpt. Folcroft, Pennsylvania 1976.
- (403) ARNULF BAUMANN: Naboths Fasttag und Josephus. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–1972, pp. 26–44.

KAMINKA (399), pp. 66–75, seeks to cast doubt on everything that Josephus has written about his deeds as commander in Galilee. SCHÜRER (400) argues that the 'War' is much more carefully composed than the 'Antiquities', and that Josephus there entered into even the smallest detail, thus providing an account the reliability of which there is no reason to doubt; but even he excepts from this favorable judgment Josephus' account of his activities in Galilee, notably his capture at Jotapata. In answer to the argument that, according to Josephus (Life 361), both Vespasian and Titus had borne witness to the accuracy of his account, KAMINKA asserts that this would vouch only for events which they knew first-hand. Moreover, we may add, if present-day analogies are of any value, one may be excused for wondering whether Vespasian and Titus, who were certainly quite busy, had time to read Josephus' work carefully before commending it or whether, as is so often the case today, such a commendation, in traditionally exaggerated tones, was written *pro forma* to a friend without a previous careful perusal. As to Agrippa's approval, it is clear, we may add, that this was qualified, since in a letter to Josephus he says (Life 365) that while Josephus seems to have written more accurately about the war than any other historian, he will supplement his account by orally informing him "of much that is not generally known."

As to Josephus' description in the 'Life' of his operations in Galilee, SCHALIT (401) rightly notes that the account is more than occasionally vague and gives the impression that Josephus is concealing more than he reveals.

To judge from Josephus (War 2. 577ff.), he simply copied the Roman method of organizing and training an army, as well as Roman tactics generally, since he had concluded, influenced, no doubt, by his visit to Rome, that the Romans owed their invincibility to discipline and military training.

BENTWICH (402) and KAMINKA (399) have noted that the description of Josephus' great military deeds and devices in Galilee generally, and especially at Jotapata, is very similar to what we find in standard Greek military textbooks; and it is consequently very tempting to suggest that Josephus may have written this account with such handbooks before him.

BAUMANN (403) claims that there is a close parallel between the public fast that Josephus proclaimed in Galilee on the initiative of the mischievous Ananias,

who hoped to catch Josephus in a defenseless condition at an assembly to be held on that day (Life 290–303), and the fast proclaimed by Naboth's enemy Queen Jezebel (1 Kings 21. 9) as a device to ensnare Naboth; but the motif is a commonplace, and there are no precisely identical details of note in the comparison.

### 8.5: Josephus' Surrender at Jotapata

- (404) HEINRICH GRAETZ: *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. 11 vols. Leipzig 1853–75. Esp. vol. 3, 5th ed. by MARCUS BRANN, 1905–6.
- (405) NORMAN BENTWICH: *Josephus*. Philadelphia 1914. Rpt. Folcroft, Pennsylvania 1976.
- (406) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Giessen 1920.
- (407) ROBERT EISLER: *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (408) JACOB N. H. SIMCHONI (SIMCHOWITZ), trans. into Hebrew: *The Writings of Josephus*. Vols. 1–2 ('Jewish War'), Warsaw 1923–28; vol. 3 ('Against Apion'), Berlin 1925.
- (409) ISRAEL ABRAHAMS: *Campaigns in Palestine from Alexander the Great*. Oxford 1927.
- (410) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus – Patriot or Traitor?* In: *Jewish Chronicle* 94, Sept. 7, 1934, pp. 26–30.
- (411) JUDAH ROSENTHAL, intro.: MENAHEM STEIN, *The Relationship between Jewish, Greek, and Roman Cultures* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1970.
- (412) AHARON KAMINKA: *The Work of Josephus in Galilee* (in Hebrew). In: *Mozenaim* 13, 1941, pp. 170–176. Rpt. in his: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944. Pp. 66–75.
- (413) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: *The Personality of Flavius Josephus in the Light of His Account of the Burning of the Temple* (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron* 7, 1942–43, pp. 290–299.
- (414) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *History of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). 5 vols. Jerusalem 1949. 5th ed., 1968.
- (415) NAHUM GLATZER: *Josephus Flavius in Klausner's Historiography* (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron* 39, 1958–59, pp. 101–105.
- (415a) PINKHOS CHURGIN: *Studies in the Time of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). New York 1949.
- (415b) THEODORE N. LEWIS: *My Faith and People: Convictions of a Rabbi*. New York 1961.
- (416) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity*. London 1951; 2nd ed., 1957.
- (416a) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Josephus: Renegade or Patriot?* In: *History Today* 8, 1958, pp. 830–836. Rpt. in his: *Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men, and Events*. New York 1969. Pp. 298–309.
- (417) JAMES W. PARKES: *The Foundations of Judaism and Christianity*. Chicago 1960.
- (418) MOSES ABERBACH: *Josephus – Patriot or Traitor?* In: *Jewish Heritage* 10, Fall 1967, pp. 13–19. Trans. into Spanish: Flavio Josefo – patriota o traidor? In: *Tribuna Israelita* (Mexico) 31, 1976, pp. 32–37.
- (419) AHARON KAMINKA: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (420) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the Sefer ha-Kabbalah with Special Emphasis on Josephus*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 59, 1968–69, pp. 171–214; 60, 1969–70, pp. 37–68, 375–406.
- (421) BERYL D. COHON: *Men at the Crossroads*. South Brunswick, New Jersey 1970. Pp. 151–172 ('Josephus: Traitor? Patriot?'); pp. 240–252 ('The Works of Josephus').

- (422) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.: *Flavius Josephus: Selections from His Works*. New York 1974.
- (423) F. LOUIS DELTOMBE: *Flavius Josèphe, un Traître à son Pays?* In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 118, 1970, pp. 8–9.
- (424) REINHOLD MAYER and CHRISTA MÖLLER: *Josephus – Politiker und Prophet*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd.: *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974.
- (425) HORST MOEHRING: *Josephus' Attitude toward the Roman Empire*. Unpublished lecture at the University Seminar for Studies on the New Testament. New York, 25 April 1975.
- (425a) EMANUEL BIN GORION: *The Paths of Legend: An Introduction to Folktales (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem 1949; 2nd ed., 1970.
- (425b) ISAAC H. HERZOG: *Something on Josephus (in Hebrew)*. In: *Sinai* 25, 1949, pp. 8–11.
- (425c) LEON D. HANKOFF: *Flavius Josephus: Suicide and Transition*. In: *New York State Journal of Medicine* 79, 1979, pp. 937–942.
- (425d) ROGER E. HERST: *The Treachery of Josephus Flavius*. In: *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal* 19. 1, 1972, pp. 82–88.

Like a recent president of the United States, Josephus seems to have left us enough evidence in his own words to indict him. To be sure, Josephus' army in Galilee, even with the intensive training which he had given it, was hardly a match for the Roman army. But one wonders why Josephus did not undertake guerrilla warfare, as the Maccabees had done so successfully more than two centuries earlier, or why he did not retreat with his army to Jerusalem, which he knew was by far the best fortified of all the Jewish strongholds, rather than to shut himself up in the tactically hopeless trap of Jotapata. The suspicion is strong that Josephus was playing a double role; and indeed he says, in an extraordinarily candid passage (*Life* 72), that when John of Gischala had requested permission to obtain the imperial corn stored in Upper Galilee, so that he might use the income therefrom to build the defenses of Gischala in Galilee, Josephus declined, since "I intended to reserve the corn either for the Romans or for my own use." Again, the fact is that at Jotapata Josephus specifically promises his men (*War* 3. 381) that "I shall never pass over to the enemy's ranks, to prove a traitor to myself," only to do so shortly thereafter. Again, the fact that in the suicide pact with his men at Jotapata, Josephus somehow managed to be among the last two has led to suspicions that he arranged the lots, and indeed, where *War* 3. 391 says that Josephus survived, "should one say by fortune or by the providence of G-d," the Slavonic version, for whatever it may be worth, but which is hardly out to discredit Josephus, quite explicitly states that "he counted the numbers with cunning and thereby misled them all."

Few have been neutral in the debate as to whether Josephus was a traitor or patriot. The great majority of scholars — GRAETZ (404), BENTWICH (405), LAQUEUR (406), and EISLER (407), among others — have condemned him as an absolute traitor to the Jewish people.

SIMCHONI (408) maintains that Josephus' action, including his defection to Rome, were dictated by moral considerations, namely his concern that the Jewish people should be preserved, and that his books be written because of his passionate love for his people.

ABRAHAMS (409) eulogizes Josephus by stating categorically that in real patriotism, loyalty to his people's spirit, and pride in its institutions, no one, not even Philo, ranks higher.

ZEITLIN (410), on the other hand, suggests that if Josephus had not joined the Roman enemies of the revolutionaries, an act which aroused suspicion that the government itself was disloyal, the rulers of the commonwealth would not have been overthrown and might well have come to terms with the Romans. But this is highly conjectural, for there is no evidence in Josephus' works of a direct connection between Josephus' surrender and the overthrow of the government in Jerusalem.

In 1935, as reported by ROSENTHAL (411), p. 14, n. 14, a spectacular mock trial of Josephus was held in Warsaw, as described in the Polish-Jewish weekly 'Opinja' (no. 5, 10 February 1935), under the auspices of the Organization of Hebrew Writers, in which MENAHEM (EDMUND) STEIN was the prosecutor and Israel Ostrotzecer the defense attorney.

In justification of Josephus, KAMINKA (412) comments on the contrast between him and Polybius, who also had been taken captive by the Romans. Josephus, he notes, devoted all his efforts to defending Judaism, so that, says KAMINKA, since the days of the prophets no one has arisen to glorify the Jews as he did, whereas Polybius turned into an apologist for the Romans. But KAMINKA neglects to note that Josephus also glorifies the Romans, remarking on their G-d-directed invincibility and on the consequent futility of the revolt. Moreover, the suspicion lingers that Josephus may have glorified Judaism because of a strong sense of guilt for what he had done. URBACH (413) rightly takes KAMINKA to task for attempting to absolve Josephus of all blame in the rebellion against Rome.

One is confronted with the paradox that KLAUSNER (414), volume 5, pp. 166–192, who identified himself completely with the cause of the revolutionaries and saw a parallel in the Jewish revolutionary struggle against the British mandate after the Second World War, nevertheless sought to justify Josephus' surrender to the Romans on the ground that Josephus, guided by an inner voice, was so deeply imbued with a sense of mission to record these events for posterity that he felt that he had to survive to fulfill this task. To KLAUSNER, as GLATZER (415) has noted, Josephus was not a man of the sword but of the book. Josephus, he says, never gave up the hope of the redemption of his people. But this is, in effect, we must comment, to argue that the end justifies the means.

CHURGIN (415a) concludes that Josephus was a traitor and that the self-sacrifice of the Zealots constitutes the sharpest refutation of Josephus' account. LEWIS (415b), pp. 166–169, uncritically agrees with this view.

BRANDON (416) (416a) argues that Josephus could scarcely have given a worse impression of himself than he does in the 'Jewish War', and that we should consequently not be so quick to condemn him as an arch-Quisling. But, we may reply, Josephus could not have suppressed the account of his traitorous action, since it was so well known to his compatriots.

PARKES (417) goes to the other extreme and remarks that Josephus' defeat and surrender in Galilee were probably among the happiest experiences of his



life. The priests, he says, were particularly influential among the Sadducees, who were supporters of the Establishment and who had succeeded in producing a working compromise between Judaism and Hellenism. But, we must reply, despite the prominence of the Sadducees among the priests, Josephus the priest identified himself as a Pharisee (Life 12). Moreover, to judge from the Talmud's account of Rabban Gamaliel and others, the Pharisees also were highly knowledgeable in Greek culture; and such a Pharisaic leader as Joḥanan ben Zakkai was certainly opposed to the revolution.

ABERBACH (418) argues that the government in Jerusalem, unlike the people, did not apparently regard Josephus' defection as an act of treason, and that, in any case, the government, headed by the high priest Anan and others who had in the past been consistently pro-Roman, was stalling for time; it knew nothing of how to conduct a war, and in fact missed the opportunity to form alliances with other rebellious peoples on the borders of the Roman Empire and with the Jews of the Diaspora. This government, both Pharisees and Sadducees, was then preparing to negotiate with the Romans. Hence it is the government that should be blamed, not Josephus. Some of the people in Jerusalem, says Josephus, condemned him as a coward, others as a traitor; but nowhere does he indicate that he was censured by the government. Hence Josephus was not a traitor to his government. On the other hand, Josephus was under no legal or moral obligation to accept the writ of the provisional extremist government, which, even if it enjoyed popular support, was nevertheless illegitimate. Though Josephus was a contemptible person and a mediocre historian, he had patriotic motives in seeking to allow the Jewish people to live. Josephus, says ABERBACH, impressed with the tremendous success of Jews in winning proselytes, saw the revolt as ruining the prospect of a gradual transformation of the entire Roman Empire from a pagan to a Jewish or, at any rate, a semi-Jewish state. Much of this, we may remark, aside from its attempt to make the end justify the means, sounds like the attempt of Adolf Eichmann at his trial in Jerusalem in 1961 to shift responsibility to his superiors; but the court in that case argued that this was not a valid defense for manifest crimes.

KAMINKA (419), pp. 75–79, remarks that Josephus was not the only Jew who sought peace with the Romans, and cites the great rabbi Joḥanan ben Zakkai, compared to whom, he says, we can appreciate Josephus' greatness, for he allied himself with the revolutionaries until the last possible hour.

ZEITLIN (420) says that in the eyes of Joḥanan ben Zakkai Josephus would not have been regarded as a traitor; and he puts the blame on the leaders who appointed him and who spoke openly for war but who actually sought peace with the Romans. But, we may reply, Josephus did not ally himself with the revolutionaries until the last possible hour, surrendering in 67, three years before the fall of Jerusalem and seven years before the fall of Masada. And Joḥanan did not assist Vespasian during the siege, nor did he receive any personal reward through his contacts with Vespasian, whereas Josephus joined Titus during the siege and constantly urged the Jews to submit; and after the fall of Jerusalem he received such rewards from Titus as a tract of land outside Jerusalem, some sacred books, the liberation of some friends, Roman citizenship, lodging in the

former palace of Vespasian, and a pension. One cannot avoid conjecturing that Josephus had done something to earn such magnificent treatment.

COHON (421) attempts to excuse Josephus' action by arguing that we must allow for the standards of the age, just as we must do so in judging Josephus as an historian when he gives a slant to history. This point is developed by WASSERSTEIN (422), who contends that ancient conceptions of loyalty and honor, as seen, for example, in the cases of Themistocles and Alcibiades, both of whom went over to their country's enemies, may well have been different from ours. But in reply we may state that while no one denies that there are and have been traitors, the actions of Themistocles and Alcibiades are clearly condemned and regarded as utterly exceptional.

DELTOMBE (423) leaves the question open as to whether or not Josephus should be termed a traitor; but he suggests that Josephus, as well as Agrippa II and the latter's sister Berenice, all of whom were collaborationists, were justified by political necessity. Such an argument, we may add, may always be used by Quislings; men of honor look upon loyalty to their country as overriding 'political necessity'.

MAYER and MÖLLER (424) comment on a number of points in Josephus' life, especially his political activities in Galilee and his defection to the Romans. In an apology for Josephus, whom they take too seriously, they declare that Josephus found himself in the position of a classical prophet, perhaps of a Jeremiah.

MOEHRING (425), presenting an interpretation that is hardly new, argues that the pro-Roman attitude of Josephus was not an expression of his opportunism but rather was based on a sober examination of the situation in which the Jews found themselves in the Roman Empire. He argues that Josephus was right in stating that the *pax Romana* constituted the best safeguard for the freedom of the Jews to live according to their ancestral laws. Josephus, he notes, stresses that many of the most decisive events in the history of the Jewish people had taken place outside the borders of Palestine; and he strives to prove that historically the Jews were worse off under Jewish than under Roman rule. Finally, he notes the parallel in attitude toward Rome on the part of Josephus and of his contemporary Johanan ben Zakkai. To this we may reply that the attempt to separate being a Jew from being a Judaeon is a misreading of the mainstream of Jewish history; since the very days of Moses nationalism has been an integral part of Judaism. If Josephus, as is true, stresses the great events in the history of Jewry that have occurred outside Palestine, this, we may suggest, is because Josephus is justifying his own desertion of the land of Israel. To assert that Josephus was not an opportunist is to disregard the personal benefits that he derived from the Flavians. In this respect he differs from Johanan ben Zakkai, who, to be sure, shared his positive attitude toward the Romans.

BIN GORION (425a), p. 20, briefly discusses the question whether the story of Josephus' men in the cave at Jotapata is legend or fact.

HERZOG (425b) is undecided as to whether Josephus was a traitor. He conjectures that in recalling Josephus, Simon ben Gamaliel may simply have wanted

to investigate the charges against him or that perhaps he was influenced by John of Gischala.

HANKOFF (425c), a psychiatrist, comments on the rebirth imagery and religious symbolism pervading Josephus' account of the cave at Jotapata. He notes the symbolism of numbers (especially the number forty in the cave). He comments on the psychologically axial position that this incident appears to have occupied in his life.

HERST (425d) insightfully remarks that the weakness of the case for the prosecution against Josephus is that all the evidence comes from his own pen. Josephus, he says, was a diplomatic ambassador and not a high-ranking general; hence the purpose of his mission in Galilee was to disarm the rebels, not to make war. Josephus, he concludes, was hardly a determining factor in the defeat of the Jewish armies. If so, however, we may ask, why was Josephus appointed as general in Galilee, the most important theater of the war, in view of the fact that the Roman armies would be invading Galilee first coming down from Syria? The fact that Josephus fought the wrong kind of war in Galilee meant, we may add, the loss of the most populous region of Jewish Palestine to the Romans.

## 8.6: Josephus' Prophecy to Vespasian

- (426) ALAN LETTOFSKY: *The War of the Jews against the Romans according to Josephus and the Talmudic Sources* (in Hebrew). Senior Honors Paper, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. 1959.
- (427) YITZHAK BAER: *Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.
- (428) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Josephus Flavius*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (429) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *The Prophecies of Josephus and of Rabban Johanan ben Zakkai on the Ascent of Vespasian to the Throne* (in Hebrew). In: SAUL LIEBERMAN and ARTHUR HYMAN, edd., *Salo Wittmayer Baron Jubilee Vol. Jerusalem 1974* (i.e. 1975). Vol. 3, pp. 397–422 (a much longer version appears in: *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, edd. HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, vol. 2.2, Berlin 1975, pp. 208–327: *Die Erhebung Vespasians nach Flavius Josephus, Talmud und Midrasch. Zur Geschichte einer messianischen Prophetie*).
- (430) WILHELM WEBER: *Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus*. Stuttgart 1921.
- (431) ETHELBERT STAUFFER: *Der Hofprophet mit dem Alten Testament*. In his: *Christus und die Caesaren. Historische Skizzen*. 5th ed., Hamburg 1960. Translated into English by K. and R. GREGOR SMITH: *Christ and the Caesars*. London 1955.
- (432) AZRIEL SHOCHAT: *On the 'Ambiguous Oracle' in the Words of Josephus* (in Hebrew). In: MICHAEL HÄNDEL, ed., *Sefer Yosef Shiloh*. Tel-Aviv 1961. Pp. 163–165.
- (433) JOHN GWYN GRIFFITHS: *Tacitus Hist. 5. 13. 2 and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. In: *Rheinisches Museum* 113, 1970, pp. 363–368.
- (434) JACOB NEUSNER: *A History of the Jews in Babylonia*. Vol. 1: *The Parthian Period*. Leiden 1965.

- (435) RUDOLF MEYER: *Der Prophet aus Galiläa*. Leipzig 1940.
- (436) ISTVAN HAHN: Josephus und die Eschatologie von Qumran. In: HANS BARDTKE, ed., *Qumran-Probleme* (Vorträge des Leipziger Symposiums über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961). Berlin 1963. Pp. 167–191.
- (437) LLOYD GASTON: *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (Novum Testamentum, Supplement 23). Leiden 1970.
- (438) MEHAHEM STERN: Zealots. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica Year Book 1973*. Jerusalem 1973. Pp. 135–152.
- (438a) HEINZ R. GRAF: *Suetons Bild des Kaisers Vespasian*. Diss., Halle 1937. Also published as: *Kaiser Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu Suetons Vita Divi Vespasiani*. Stuttgart 1937.
- (438b) ANTHONY J. SALDARINI: Johanan ben Zakkai's Escape from Jerusalem: Origin and Development of a Rabbinic Story. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 6, 1975, pp. 189–204.
- (438c) GEDALYAHU ALON: Rabban Johanan b. Zakkai's Removal to Jabneh (in Hebrew). In his: *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 269–313.
- (438d) PETER SCHÄFER: Die Flucht Johanan b. Zakkais aus Jerusalem und die Gründung des 'Lehrhauses' in Jabne. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 2.19.2, Berlin 1979, pp. 43–101.

After his capture by the Romans at Jotapata in 67, Josephus was brought before the general Vespasian; and, claiming to speak the words of G-d, he proceeded to predict Vespasian's accession to the throne (War 3. 400–402). Two years later, when Vespasian was indeed proclaimed emperor, he remembered the prophecy and freed Josephus from chains (War 4. 623–629). One is initially inclined to doubt the veracity of Josephus' account because it does seem to fit in so well with the dynastic propaganda of the Flavian house and sounds as if it may have been invented as part of a dynastic legend designed to confer the sanctity of divine approval upon the Flavians and as part of Josephus' ever-recurring boastfulness.

Moreover, strangely enough, the Talmud (Giṭṭin 56a–b) has a similar prediction by the great Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai, who, during the siege of Jerusalem, managed to be smuggled out of the city and who proceeded to greet the general Vespasian as emperor. There Johanan is not a prisoner, and the news that Vespasian has been proclaimed emperor comes precisely after Johanan has made his prediction, although, as LETTOFSKY (426) has noted, in some of the rabbinic sources, such as Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan 4.5, Johanan's request for Yavneh and its scholars precedes the prediction, thus indicating that Johanan was known to be sympathetic to Vespasian and did not have to be obsequious to him. BAER (427) hypothesizes that the story of Johanan's escape is a mere transference to Johanan of what Josephus had told about himself, combined with material about flight from a besieged city taken from books of military strategy. But, as SCHALIT (428) has noted, there is some substance in both Josephus' account of himself and in the Talmud's of Johanan, for Josephus could not have misrepresented so brazenly a story which involved the very Emperor Vespasian under whose patronage he had written the account of the war. [See *infra*, p. 904.]

SCHALIT (429) concludes that though there is an echo of historical fact in the Talmudic account, Josephus is more credible. Josephus, he says, functioned

not only as a Jew but also as a priest who was expert in ancient writings and thus was more readily believed. Josephus' chief aim was to save his life, Johanan's to save Jerusalem; both succeeded beyond their immediate aims.

That Josephus' account has some historic basis is indicated by the occurrence of similar anecdotes in Suetonius (Vespasian 5. 6) and Dio Cassius (66. 1), though, of course, the repetition by several different authors does not make such an anecdote history. According to Suetonius, Josephus predicted that he would soon be released by Vespasian, who would then, however, be emperor. In Josephus, however, there is no prediction that he will soon be released by Vespasian. According to Dio, Josephus laughed (a new element) and predicted that Vespasian would become emperor a year later and would then release him. Dio's source, neither here nor in the version of the assassination of Caligula and the accession of Claudius, appears to be Josephus because of discrepancies in the accounts: in Josephus it is not until two years later that Vespasian is proclaimed emperor and he is released. Indirect confirmation comes also from Philostratus 5. 27, who tells how Vespasian consulted Apollonius of Tyana in Alexandria with regard to the idea of making himself emperor, which had suggested itself to him during the siege of Jerusalem. The classic discussion of the whole matter remains that of WEBER (430).

SCHALIT (428) notes a parallel between the role of Josephus in the accession of Vespasian and that of Agrippa I in the accession of Claudius; but, we may comment, the similarity is only superficial, since Agrippa played a key role in the accession itself, whereas Josephus was only a prisoner who prophesied this but took no positive action to translate this prophecy into fact.

How could Josephus (and/or Johanan) have managed to make such a remarkable prophecy? STAUFFER (431), pp. 155–159, suggests that at Jotapata Josephus had a vision which revealed to him the meaning of the ambiguous prophecy in the Book of Daniel concerning the four world-kingdoms. He suggests, though without evidence, that Josephus was a bankrupt candidate for the role of Messiah who led his nation to ruin through his exegesis of Daniel and then left his people in the lurch in order to save his life as a Roman prophet.

SHOCHAT (432) suggests that both the prophecy of Josephus and that of Johanan go back to a common source. And, indeed, Josephus (War 6. 312), Suetonius (Vespasian 4), and Tacitus (Histories 5. 13) all speak of a prediction that someone from Judaea would become ruler of the world at that time. A similar spirit is found in a passage in one of the Dead Sea Scrolls, as noted by GRIFFITHS (433). The prophecy, GRIFFITHS remarks, could not have been openly and explicitly anti-Roman if, as indeed was the case, it was applied to Vespasian; and indeed, as NEUSNER (434), pp. 110–113, remarks, Johanan ben Zakkai was not the first nor the last holy man to predict Vespasian's Imperial rule.

SHOCHAT (432) says that the reference here is to the prophecy in Isaiah 10. 33–34; but the key point of the prophecy in Josephus, Suetonius, and Tacitus is that the ruler would come at that very time, and this would seem to go back to the mysterious prophecy of Daniel, as MEYER (435), HAHN (436), and GASTON (437), pp. 458–462, all note. This prophecy, according to Josephus in another

passage (Ant. 10. 276), refers to the Roman Empire and predicts that the Romans will capture Jerusalem and destroy the Temple.

Undoubtedly, as SCHALIT (428) and STERN (438) have most recently argued with some cogency, there was a Messianic basis to the revolt against Rome, as there was to be in the revolt of Lukuas Andreas against Trajan in 115–117 and the revolt of Bar Kochba against Hadrian in 132–135. But instead of applying the Messianic prophecy to the Jews, Josephus and Johanan applied it to the Roman Vespasian, just as Cyrus in Isaiah 45. 1 is called Messiah (“anointed”).

GRAF (438a), pp. 21–30, notes that Josephus’ report (War 6. 312–313) agrees almost verbatim with the report of Tacitus (Histories 5. 13) and concludes that Josephus’ and Suetonius’ (Vespasian 5. 6) reports on the prophecies to Vespasian go back to a common source – Vespasian’s commentaries, which Suetonius used via Pliny.

SALDARINI (438b), independently of SCHALIT, after comparing the various rabbinic versions of the story of Johanan ben Zakkai’s meeting with Vespasian, asserts that the close parallel between Johanan’s escape and that of Josephus (War 3. 387–408) suggests that this type of story circulated after the great revolt.

ALON (438c) argues that Johanan’s exit occurred earlier and not just before the destruction of the Temple, inasmuch as Josephus says that the Jews who gave themselves up to the Romans were settled by Vespasian in Jabneh in the summer of 68 (War 4. 444).

I have not seen SCHÄFER (438d). [See *infra*, p. 904.]

## 8.7: Josephus and Justus of Tiberias

- (439) TESSA RAJAK: Justus of Tiberias. In: *Classical Quarterly* 23, 1973, pp. 345–368.
- (440) RICHARD LAQUEUR: Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage. Giessen 1920.
- (441) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (442) HANS DREXLER: Untersuchungen zu Josephus und zur Geschichte des jüdischen Aufstandes 66–70. In: *Klio* 19, 1925, pp. 277–312.
- (443) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus und Justus. Studien zur Vita des Josephus. In: *Klio* 26, 1933, pp. 67–95.
- (444) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Justus of Tiberias. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 479–480.
- (445) FELIX JACOBY: Iustus (9). In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 10, 1917, cols. 1341–1346.
- (446) HARALD HEGERMANN: Griechisch-jüdisches Schrifttum. In: JOHANN MAIER and JOSEF SCHREINER, edd., *Literatur und Religion des Frühjudentums. Eine Einführung*. Würzburg 1973. Pp. 163–180.
- (447) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*. Cincinnati 1974.

We would give much to have another account of the ‘War’ with which to check Josephus. We know that Justus of Tiberias composed such a narrative attacking Josephus’ version of the war; but it is lost, presumably because it was not deemed substantial enough to merit preservation by the Church and because

it lacked the overwhelming asset of Josephus, namely the reference to Jesus, whether interpolated in whole or in part, though as RAJAK (439) comments, if indeed the passage was interpolated in Josephus it could have been inserted in Justus as well. But, we may remark, Justus may have restricted himself to the war proper and hence may have supplied no opening for an interpolator.

LAQUEUR (440) postulates, though with no evidence, that Justus had attacked Josephus' style and that this competition from Justus meant financial ruin for Josephus.

If so, asks COHEN (441), why did the 'Life' not revise the 'War', just as 'Antiquities', 14, had revised the 'War'? Such a revision would have produced a more nationalistic work and certainly one superior in style to the 'Life'. By basing his 'Life' on his official report, Josephus fought back where he was least effective. Moreover, inasmuch as the Emperor Titus favored the 'War', the competition with Justus would have had no direct financial impact upon Josephus.

In his 'Life' Josephus defends himself, but most scholars have been skeptical of the accusations of bribery, theft, and moral turpitude which Josephus levies against Justus. DREXLER (442) and SCHALIT (443) regard the dispute between Josephus and Justus as a personal one, with Josephus' character the central issue. The invective exchanged by them is typological. Elsewhere SCHALIT (444) suggests that the conflict between them arose because Justus did all he could to ensure the continued rule of his friend Agrippa in Tiberias, whereas Josephus sought to extend his own influence over all Galilee.

RAJAK (439), in a systematic and balanced, if largely unoriginal, treatment, plausibly concludes that the rivalry between Josephus and Justus was between two realists, both of whom knew that the war was foolish and who clashed because each was playing his own double game. In the end Justus fled for protection to the collaborationist Agrippa, whereas Josephus joined Vespasian.

In answer to the question as to why Justus (Life 359–360) waited for twenty years before publishing his work, JACOBY (445) suggests that Justus, who was imperial secretary at the court of Agrippa II (Life 356), did not have the time for a literary career until the death of Agrippa allowed him to return to private life. But we may comment that Nicolaus of Damascus was not kept from pursuing his literary career, though he held a more demanding position, that of adviser to Herod.

RAJAK (439) plausibly suggests that Justus could not have attacked Josephus during Agrippa's lifetime, since Agrippa had declared Josephus' work to be trustworthy (Life 365). She believes that Josephus' account is honest and not distorted; but, we may remark, Josephus seems to be protesting too much to be fully credible. It may be, moreover, that both Justus and Josephus are guilty of distortions, in view of their shady roles in the war.

HEGERMANN (446), pp. 178–180, presents a very brief sketch of Justus' work and of his relation to Josephus.

WACHOLDER (447), pp. 298–306, concludes that Josephus' own work, as compared with that of Justus, does not inspire confidence, though he stops short of actually preferring Justus. He suggests that the third-century Sextus Julius Africanus followed Justus in treating Herod more fairly than did Jo-

sephus, and that Justus was also more objective in treating Agrippa II. We may comment, however, that we have no evidence to support such assumptions, and that, in fact, one would not expect Justus to have been more impartial toward his dear friend Agrippa, to whom he had fled for protection.

COHEN (441) conjectures that the reason for Justus' delay in publishing his work was that after the war Tiberias had had to suffer the ignominy of seeing many cities become the autonomous rulers of extensive territories, while it was still subservient to Agrippa II and was not even the capital of his kingdom. Hence this was the perfect time for the native son to come to the defense of his city. COHEN, we may remark, looks at the 'Life' as an anti-Tiberian polemic. We may comment, however, that this merely indicates that when Justus did publish his history, it served a useful purpose; it does not explain how Justus could have foreseen that the time would come when the publication of his work would prove useful. Justus' polemic, says COHEN, caused Josephus difficulties in his attempt to court the rabbinic scholars of Yavneh, whose power suddenly increased after the war. Justus had apparently attacked Josephus' religiosity; and hence the 'Life' seeks to portray Josephus as a religious man. We may, however, ask why Josephus suppresses Justus' attacks on his religiosity, since he apparently does list Justus' other charges.



## 9: General Accounts of Josephus

### 9.0: Older Books and Articles on Josephus in General

- (448) ADOLF SCHLATTER: *Wie Sprach Josephus von G-t?* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 14. 1). Gütersloh 1910.
- (449) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage.* Giessen 1920. Chapters 6 (Die Aktenstücke bei Josephus), pp. 221–230, und 8 (Der Werdegang von Josephus), pp. 245–279, reprinted in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed., *Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84).* Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 104–113; 70–103.
- (450) WILHELM WEBER: *Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus.* Stuttgart 1921.
- (451) ROBERT EISLER: *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC.* Die messianische Unabhängigkeitsbewegung vom Auftreten Johannes des Täufers bis zum Untergang Jakobus des Gerechten nach der neuerschlossenen Eroberung von Jerusalem des Flavius Josephus und den christlichen Quellen. Mit Abbildungen einer Auswahl der unveröffentlichten altrussischen Handschriften und anderer Urkunden, einer Erstausgabe der wichtigsten slavischen Stellen nach Abschriften von ALEXANDER BERENDTS und VASSILYI ISTRIN, sowie den Überresten des rumänischen Josephus übersetzt von MOSES GASTER. Vol. 1. Heidelberg 1929; vol. 2. Heidelberg 1930. Abridged and revised English translation by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE: *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus' Recently Discovered 'Capture of Jerusalem' and the Other Jewish Christian Sources.* London 1931.
- (452) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian.* New York 1929. Rpt. with introduction by SAMUEL SANDMEL: New York 1967.
- (453) OTTO MICHEL and OTTO BAUERNFEIND, trans.: *Flavius Josephus. De bello judaico. Der jüdische Krieg. Griechisch und Deutsch.* Vol. 3 (with T. HIRSCH): *Ergänzungen und Register.* München 1969.
- (454) EMIL SCHÜRER: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi.* 3 vols. 3rd and 4th ed., Leipzig 1901–9.
- (455) EMIL SCHÜRER: *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus,* ed. NAHUM N. GLATZER. New York 1961.
- (456) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. to A.D. 135).* Revised and edited by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973.
- (456a) MENAHEM STERN: *A New English Schürer.* In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, 1974, pp. 419–424.
- (457) BENEDICTUS NIESE: *Der jüdische Historiker Josephus.* In: *Historische Zeitschrift* 40, 1896, p. 193–237. English trans. in: JAMES HASTINGS, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* 7, 1914, pp. 569–579.
- (458) ALFRED EDERSHEIM: *Josephus.* In: WILLIAM SMITH and HENRY WACE, edd., *A Dictionary of Christian Biography* 3, London 1882, pp. 441–460.

- (459) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: Josephus. In: JAMES HASTINGS, ed., *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Extra Vol., 1904, pp. 461–473.
- (460) ADOLF SCHLATTER: *Kleinere Schriften zu Flavius Josephus*, ed. KARL H. RENGSTORF. Rpt. Darmstadt 1970.
- (461) BERNHARD BRÜNE: *Flavius Josephus und seine Schriften in ihrem Verhältnis zum Judentume, zur griechisch-römischen Welt und zum Christentume mit griechischer Wortkonkordanz zum Neuen Testamente und I. Clemensbriefe nebst Sach- und Namen-Verzeichnis. Anhang: Inhalt nebst Sachregister zu „Josephus der Geschichtsschreiber“*. Gütersloh 1913.
- (462) NORMAN BENTWICH: *Josephus*. Philadelphia 1914. Rpt. Folcroft, Pennsylvania 1976.
- (463) MARTIN P. CHARLESWORTH: *The Adventurer*. In his: *Five Men. Character Studies from the Roman Empire*. Cambridge, Mass. 1936; rpt. Freeport, New York 1967. Pp. 65–93.
- (464) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: *Josephus*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (465) WILLY STAERK, rev.: RICHARD LAQUEUR, *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus*. In: *Theologische Zeitschrift* 47, 1922, pp. 493–495.
- (466) RUDOLF HELM, rev.: RICHARD LAQUEUR, *Der jüdische Historiker Josephus*. In *Philologische Wochenschrift* 41, 1921, pp. 481–493, 505–516.
- (467) EDWARD R. LEVENSON: *New Tendentious Motifs in Antiquities: A Study of Development in Josephus' Historical Thought*. Diss., M.A., Columbia University, New York 1966.
- (468) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (469) EDWYN BEVAN: *Josephus*. In: *Quarterly Review* 253, July 1929, pp. 85–100.
- (470) RICHARD LAQUEUR, rev.: WILHELM WEBER, *Josephus und Vespasian*. In: *Philologische Wochenschrift* 41, 1921, pp. 1105–1114.
- (471) HEINRICH GUTTMANN: *Die Darstellung der jüdischen Religion bei Flavius Josephus*. Breslau 1928.
- (472) FREDERICK J. FOAKES-JACKSON: *Josephus and the Jews. The Religion and History of the Jews as Explained by Flavius Josephus*. New York 1930. Rpt. with introduction by C. F. PFEIFFER: Grand Rapids 1977.
- (473) WILLEM LODDER: *Die Schätzung des Quirinus bei Flavius Josephus. Eine Untersuchung: Hat sich Josephus in der Datierung der bekannten Schätzung (Luk. 2. 2) geirrt?* Leipzig 1930.
- (474) SALOMO RAPPAPORT: *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus*. Wien 1930.
- (474a) GLEN W. BOWERSOCK: *Old and New in the History of Judaea*. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 65, 1975, pp. 180–185.
- (474b) MOSHE CARMILLY-WEINBERGER: *Censorship and Freedom of Expression in Jewish History*. New York 1977.

Since no important book of more general scope has appeared during the period under review, it may be helpful to list the important works on Josephus that were published before 1937. For further critique of the older literature, notably SCHLATTER (448), LAQUEUR (449), WEBER (450), EISLER (451), and THACKERAY (452), see MICHEL–BAUERNFEIND (453), vol. 3, pp. xx–xxvi.

Of the older books clearly the most famous is SCHÜRER (454), which, though not directly on Josephus, utilizes him on almost every page. But SCHÜRER, we must not forget, wrote his text to help students gain a background for the New Testament. He equated Judaism with legalism, which he disdained, and in any case his use of Rabbinic materials was almost totally restricted to the Mishnah. The work went through four editions in SCHÜRER's own lifetime, and

since then there have been several editions of portions of the work. The edition by GLATZER (455) covers the first part of SCHÜRER, extensively revising the notes and adding several appendices. The thoroughly revised edition of VERMES and MILLER (456), besides taking advantage of the many archaeological discoveries in recent years, goes far to erase SCHÜRER's prejudices and to eliminate, in particular, his deficiency in handling Rabbinic materials. STERN (456a) praises the revised work as a whole but criticizes it on a number of points of chronology.

Of the brief accounts the best in any language is NIESE's (457), which is amazingly detailed for so condensed a treatment, and which excels on such points as Josephus' sources for his narrative of the Biblical period and Josephus' religious views. NIESE, whose knowledge of the text was unsurpassed, presents a well-balanced judgment of Josephus as an historian, noting that while he is often rhetorical and sometimes sacrifices truth to prejudice, he attained, on the whole, a highly creditable standard of historiography.

Other fine brief treatments are by EDERSHEIM (458) and THACKERAY (459), both of whom, particularly the latter, present particularly good surveys of Josephus' interpretation of the Bible, noting especially his additions and omissions.

A brief survey, admirable for its philological acumen and for its comparisons with Palestinian Judaism, is SCHLATTER (448). This study, together with 'Die hebräischen Namen bei Josephus' (Gütersloh 1913) and 'Der Bericht über das Ende Jerusalems. Ein Dialog mit Wilhelm Weber' (Gütersloh 1923), has been reprinted (460) with a short introduction, largely devoted to a biography of SCHLATTER by RENGSTORF, and with corrigenda.

A badly organized but extremely comprehensive work is BRÜNE (461), who notes the resemblances in diction between Josephus and Polybius, and, to a lesser extent, Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon; in his religious views, Josephus is presented as an advocate of both faith and reason; he is 'quasi-Pharisaic', while his rationalism is Platonic-Pythagorean.

In a readable, popular, and still reliable work directed primarily to Jewish readers, BENTWICH (462) is unsympathetic to Josephus as a person (he stresses Josephus' boastfulness and cowardice) or as a writer ("once a compiler, always a compiler"); but BENTWICH, we may suggest, goes too far in denying Josephan authorship of certain passages of 'Against Apion' merely because they appear to be too eloquent to be Josephus'.

Among the brief popular, descriptive surveys of Josephus' life we may mention CHARLESWORTH (463), who is lively and critical.

HÖLSCHER (464) is strong on such matters as Josephus' sources, the relation of Josephus to the text of the Septuagint in the early books of the 'Antiquities', and an analysis of the contents of his works, especially of the 'Antiquities'. He is extreme, however, in asserting that Josephus' sources are always second-hand, since for his own period, in which he himself was so active a participant, Josephus surely had some first-hand information. HÖLSCHER plausibly explains the contradictions and variations in style within Josephus by asserting that they are due to the various sources (rather than, as THACKERAY [452] contended, the assistants) that he employed. But he has nothing on Josephus'

religious views (and their relationship to Halakhah), philosophical views (including philosophy of history), and historiographical method.

LAQUEUR (449), in what is still the most important single work on Josephus, met with the most varied response when his book was issued. STAERK (465) rightly termed it pioneering; HELM (466) annihilated it in an unusually sharp attack. As he had done in a book on Polybius, LAQUEUR reacts against the school of source-criticism in Germany which endeavored to explain contradictions by finding various sources for the different parts of a work. To LAQUEUR, Josephus' attitude in each of his major works may be explained by the circumstances in which he found himself. Thus, the 'Jewish War', written when the Parthians were threatening the Romans in the East, proclaims that the Romans are invincible. On the other hand, when he wrote the 'Antiquities', Josephus was no longer in the employ of the government. Moreover, to judge from such contemporary writers as Tacitus, anti-Semitism among intellectuals, at least, was powerful; hence Josephus, as a so-called traitor who was now disillusioned, composed the 'Antiquities' in an attempt to win back the favor of his people, whose status had declined under Domitian. But anti-Semitism, we may add, was no more fierce at the time of Tacitus than it was earlier (cf., e.g. Cicero's 'Pro Flacco'). LAQUEUR has a detailed comparison of 'Antiquities', 14, with the 'War', asserting that lack of space had restricted his investigation; but LEVENSON (467), who extended his analysis to a treatment of the parallel sections in War 1-2 and Antiquities 12-20, concludes that LAQUEUR's theory was valid, though, as COHEN (468) now more accurately shows, following THACKERAY (452), p. 107, there is considerably more closeness between 'Antiquities', 14, and the corresponding passages in the 'War' than between the later books of the 'Antiquities' and the corresponding passages in the 'War'. Hence LAQUEUR's choice of Book 14 of the 'Antiquities' for detailed comparison is unfortunate because it is unrepresentative of the work as a whole.

LAQUEUR's (449) most famous – and most fantastic – theory is that Josephus, when his fame as an author was threatened by the stylistically superior work of Justus of Tiberias, who, LAQUEUR says, had also attacked him for misrepresenting the Bible and for using the Septuagint instead of the Hebrew text as his basis, inserted the 'Testimonium Flavianum' about Jesus into the 'Antiquities' in order to win a sale among Christians. If so, as BEVAN (469) has commented, this last ruse of the old fox was the most successful of all. LAQUEUR argues that by the end of the first century a movement against the Septuagint was gaining strength in the rabbinical schools; but, we may comment, while it is true that there is a passage in the Talmud (Soferim 1. 7) attacking the Septuagint, the Talmud (Megillah 9a) elsewhere praises the translation and presents a miraculous explanation of the fact that all seventy (or seventy-two) translators emerged with identical versions. This latter Talmudic passage is found in a context which reflects a period after the first century. Moreover, we may ask why if Domitian, who was emperor at the time that Josephus issued the 'Antiquities' and whose favor Josephus continued to hold, persecuted the Christians, Josephus would have risked alienating him. We know that Domitian hated Titus, who had been Josephus' chief supporter for years; and it would seem

likely, therefore, that Josephus would have been unusually careful not to alienate Domitian. Again, LAQUEUR speaks as if Josephus, in desperation for money, sought Christian customers; but because of his pension and his lavish quarters in Rome (there is no evidence that he lost these under Domitian) Josephus hardly was destitute. Finally, if Josephus appended 'Against Apion' to the 'Antiquities' in order to defend the Jews, why would he have offended them by inserting the "Testimonium"? Even if Josephus had alienated most of the Jews, there were some Jews, including many rabbis and many in the Diaspora, who, to judge from the treatment of the Sicarii by the Alexandrian Jews after the War, agreed with his bitter opposition against the revolutionaries; and inasmuch as the number of the Jews in the Roman Empire at the end of the first century was at least a hundred times as great as the number of Christians, Josephus would certainly have had a better opportunity of selling his book to Jews than to Christians.

WEBER (450), in a sharp departure from LAQUEUR, who criticizes his book vehemently (470), argues the radical thesis that Josephus, in effect, presented in his 'War' little more than a literary version of the commentaries of Vespasian and Titus. But, we may reply, while it is true that Josephus indicates (Life 358, Against Apion 1. 56) that he consulted the 'Commentaries', on both occasions when he mentions them he adds the remark that he also had first-hand knowledge of the war. Moreover, if indeed Josephus has presented hardly more than a reworking of the 'Commentaries' of the Roman generals, it would seem remarkable that Justus of Tiberias should not have heard of this and attacked him as a plagiarizer and — more — as a Roman underling. In any case, Josephus nowhere defends himself against such a charge, and, in fact, cites his own use of the 'Commentaries' in his contention that Justus was guilty of inaccuracies because he had not read the 'Commentaries'. Finally, the only definite citation from the 'Commentaries' is in the 'Life' (341–343, 410) and not in the 'War', thus casting doubt on WEBER's thesis that the 'War' is a reworking of the 'Commentaries'.

Josephus studies in this century reached their height during the period from 1928 to 1930, when no less than six volumes of interpretation appeared: GUTTMANN (471), EISLER (451), THACKERAY (452), FOAKES-JACKSON (472), LODDER (473), and RAPPAPORT (474).

Of these works, THACKERAY's, which is a series of six semi-popular lectures delivered at the Jewish Institute of Religion in New York City, is of particular value for fairness and good sense. Thus THACKERAY criticizes Josephus as a time-server and plagiarist but praises his work against Apion as a service to the Jewish people. Whether this entitles Josephus to be called a patriot is, nevertheless, highly questionable. In the most striking chapter in the book, THACKERAY, who had made an exhaustive study of Josephus' language in preparing his lexicon of Josephus, concludes that an assistant whom he calls "the Thucydidean hack" and another whom he calls "the poet-lover" had aided Josephus considerably in the composition of the later books of the 'Antiquities'. On the question of the "Testimonium Flavianum", THACKERAY reaches conclusions similar to those of EISLER, namely, that there is an authentic kernel in the passage but that it has been subjected to interpolation. SANDMEL, in the intro-

duction to the re-issue of THACKERAY, rightly notes that the lecture on 'Josephus and Christianity,' greatly influenced by EISLER as it was, is hardly acceptable to the great majority of scholars. THACKERAY unfortunately has little about the relationship of Josephus to the currents of Hellenistic historiography and about the degree to which he follows canons of historiography, about the relationship of his various works to the genres to which they belong, as well as about his relationship to rabbinic sources. But, as SANDMEL has well stated, "These lectures represent an interim report, in which a great and modest scholar took his audience into his confidence." As such, it has still not been superseded.

The work by FOAKES-JACKSON (472), which is much less original, is basically a handbook, rather over-simplified, for seminary students summarizing, without critical comment, Josephus' remarks about the Jewish religion and about the history of the Jews under the Hasmoneans and under the procurators. The reprint contains a disappointingly brief (two-page) introduction by PFEIFFER.

RAPPAPORT (474) has a valuable collection of the parallels between Josephus, additions to and modifications of the Bible and those to be found in Rabbinic midrashim; but he is far from complete and he suffers from the attempt to force parallels where there are none. Finally he fails to consider that many of the modifications of Josephus, as well as his decision whether or not to include rabbinic midrashim at any given point, may be due to a conscious appeal to his audience of Greek-speaking Jews and non-Jews.

BOWERSOCK (474a) presents detailed comments, chiefly bibliographical and epigraphical, on VERMES and MILLAR's new edition of SCHÜRER (456). He criticizes VERMES and MILLAR for mentioning Qumran material only in footnotes without integrating it into the text, for retention of SCHÜRER's tirade against Herod, and for omitting the archaeological data concerning two great Herodian cities, Caesarea and Samaria-Sebaste, that have been excavated.

CARMILLY-WEINBERGER (474b), pp. 201–208, presents brief uncritical summaries of the views of Josephus held by ISAAC MARCUS JOST (the nineteenth-century German Jewish historian), JOSEPH (he must mean RICHARD) LAQUEUR, and THACKERAY. As to LAQUEUR's skepticism, CAMILLY-WEINBERGER clearly exaggerates when he states that he believes only one thing about Josephus, namely that he was born.

### 9.1: Book-length Studies (1937–1980) Dealing with Josephus in General

- (475) MOSES BARASCH: *Josefus Flavius*. Cernăuți 1938.
- (476) LEON BERNSTEIN: *Flavius Josephus: His Time and His Critics*. New York 1938.
- (477) ALAN PONN: *The Relationship between Josephus' View of Judaism and His Conception of Political and Military Power* (Rabbinical Thesis). Cincinnati 1961 (microfilm).
- (478) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Studies in Josephus*. London 1961.
- (479) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929. Rpt. with Introduction by SAMUEL SANDMEL, New York 1967.
- (480) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: ROBERT J. H. SHUTT, *Studies in Josephus*. In *Classical World* 55, 1961–62, p. 171.
- (481) GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON: *The World of Josephus*. London 1964.

- (482) NORMAN BENTWICH: Josephus. Philadelphia 1914. Rpt. Folcroft, Pennsylvania 1976.
- (483) FREDERICK J. FOAKES-JACKSON: Josephus and the Jews. The Religion and History of the Jews as Explained by Flavius Josephus. New York 1930. Rpt. with introduction by C. F. PFEIFFER: Grand Rapids 1977.
- (484) WITOLD DZIĘCIOL: Józef Flawiusz historyk żydowski (Biblioteka polska, Seria zielona, t. 9). London 1966.
- (485) STANLEY G. LEUTY: An Inquiry into the Historical Methods and Contributions of Flavius Josephus. Diss., M.A., California State College at Fullerton, Calif. 1971 (available on microfilm from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan).
- (486) TESSA RAJAK: Josephus, Jewish History and the Greek World. Diss., 2 vols., Oxford 1974.
- (487) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed.: Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84). Darmstadt 1973.
- (488) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (488a) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: Studies in the Language and Historiography of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Ph.D., Brown University, Providence 1976.
- (488b) ROLAND G. BOMSTAD: Governing Ideas of the Jewish War of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Ph.D., Yale University, New Haven 1979.

During the period under review no important work, comparable, for example, to those of GOODENOUGH, VÖLKER, BELKIN, or WOLFSON on Philo, has appeared on Josephus.

BARASCH (475) presents a romanticized popular survey of Josephus' life and times. He himself admits that what he has written was stimulated by FEUCHTWANGER's famous novels about Josephus, and that it is not a biography but rather an account, as he sees Josephus, in relation to Jerusalem and Rome. He is clearly dependent upon translations of Josephus rather than on the Greek original.

The one comprehensive work from this period dealing with Josephus betrays on every page that it is the work of an amateur, BERNSTEIN (476). The work, written for popular consumption, is an unabashed apologia for Josephus; an indication of the passion with which the author approaches his subject is the fact that BERNSTEIN closes with a memorial prayer to the soul of Josephus, whom he compares with the prophet Jeremiah (since both admonished their brethren to listen to their king)! BERNSTEIN admits his lack of competence in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, and Aramaic; Yet his *odium theologicum* knows no bounds in attacking such scholars as ISAAC M. JOST, HEINRICH EWALD, and HEINRICH GRAETZ for their assaults on Josephus' personal character.

PONN's (477) sketchy, loosely organized rabbinical thesis contains some interesting insights, but he was clearly hampered by the apparent fact that he consulted Josephus only in English translation. He stresses that Josephus utilized religious arguments when he urged his countrymen to surrender, since he considered that the fact of Roman power was clear evidence that G-d would not intervene in the political realm. The fact that, unaware as he was of political realities, Josephus nonetheless chose to stress the religious implications, tempts one to assert, says PONN, that his statements were calculated to convey to the Jewish people the same conclusion that he had formed from a non-religious view of the political facts. The same is true of Josephus' treatment of the Zealots in

religious terms, whereas he had previously come to the same conclusion from a political point of view. Similarly Josephus' writing of the 'Antiquities' and of 'Against Apion', growing out of a political need, became expressions of religious content. In Josephus' view political independence was not a *sine qua non* for Judaism. But, we may comment, this presupposes that Josephus was less than sincere in his religious attitude, and there is no evidence for this. Again, when PONN says that to Josephus religion has nothing to do with political matters, he neglects, for example, Josephus' praise of the theocratic constitution which Moses conveyed to the Israelites. Finally, PONN does not prove his contention that changes in the political situation of the Roman world were reflected by a change in attitude in Josephus' writings.

SHUTT (478) has inconclusive discussions of the influence of Nicolaus of Damascus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Polybius, and Strabo on the style of Josephus' 'Antiquities'. He persuasively argues, contrary to THACKERAY (479), that in the 'War' Josephus' assistants merely polished his translation from the original Aramaic, and that he did not employ assistants for the 'Antiquities', which he composed many years later. SHUTT rightly says that one must allow for development in Josephus' knowledge of Greek; but in Josephus' case, we must reply, the Greek of the 'Antiquities' is considerably inferior to that of the 'War', probably because of the help which Josephus had received in the latter work, and hence it is difficult to trace this development. SHUTT is less satisfactory in his brief survey of Josephus' life and works; it does seem extravagant to call Josephus a great historian comparable to Thucydides, as I have noted in my review (480). The statement (p. 126) that a clue to the explanation of Josephus' faults of excessive pride and pugnaciousness "may perhaps be found in the fact that Josephus was of Oriental Semitic stock" is regrettable.

WILLIAMSON's (481) popularly written book makes no claim to originality, but the style has greater freshness, vitality, and humor than that of BENTWICH (482) or FOAKES-JACKSON (483). He presents a convincing picture of Josephus as unspiritual, perfidious, and self-righteous. And yet the book must be termed a disappointment. It gives too much attention to Christianity, which, as WILLIAMSON himself realizes, was hardly noticed by Josephus, even if we regard with WILLIAMSON, as few will, the Jesus passage in the 'Antiquities' and in the Slavonic Josephus as completely authentic. And WILLIAMSON is certainly not justified, as one can see from Book 2 of 'Against Apion', in saying that Josephus became at least half-pagan. If WILLIAMSON had compared Josephus with his sources, where it is possible to do so, he would hardly subscribe to the view that except where his own conduct is in question Josephus is precise and conscientious.

DZIĘCIOL (484), to judge from the summary in English (pp. 199–203), is a general, popular survey, clearly partial to Josephus, who, he says, is on a par as an historian with Thucydides, Polybius, Livy, and Tacitus, and whom he calls one of the most intelligent Jewish generals.

LEUTY (485) focuses on the apparent contradictions between the 'War' and the 'Life', the view of the 'War' as Flavian propaganda, the sources of the 'Antiquities', and the 'Testimonium Flavianum'. His work is highly unoriginal,



superficial, and generally uncritical, being based on an English translation of Josephus, and restricting itself to secondary sources in English, especially THACKERAY (479). As to Josephus' life he concludes that he was a realist rather than a traitor. He examines 'Against Apion' at relatively great length (pp. 56–82) to determine Josephus' views regarding Judaism, but it does not occur to him that it might be worthwhile to compare these views with those expressed by Philo and by the Talmud to determine Josephus' distinctive position. LEUTY says that Josephus' popularity in antiquity is due to the fact that he wrote tragic, i.e. sensational, history, which was calculated to teach a moral; but we may here note that Josephus was hardly popular in antiquity, passages from his works being cited by only one extant pagan writer, Porphyry in the fourth century, and by only three Christians, Theophilus, Hippolytus, and Origen before Porphyry. [See *infra*, p. 905.]

RAJAK (486), directed by FERGUS MILLAR, ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO, and GEZA VERMES, has written a study of Josephus' historiography, undertaken from the point of view of an ancient historian; but I have been unable to see it. According to a communication from the author it is a study of the interplay between Josephus' Jewish background, the Greek intellectual influence, and the Roman political impact.

SCHALIT (487) is a reprinting, with translations into German where the original was in another language, of important articles and excerpts of books by various scholars since 1900 on key questions in research on Josephus, though some of the pieces are only tangential to Josephus. Of the thirteen items only five date from the period covered by this survey.

COHEN (488) has written a comparative study of the 'War' and the 'Life'. It is a keenly critical survey.

LADOUCEUR (488a) deals critically with selected topics in connection with Josephus, notably THACKERAY's theory that Josephus had assistants, the various theories to explain the composition of the 'War', the relations between Rome and Parthia as described by Josephus, and the theory that Dionysius of Halicarnassus exercised substantial influence upon Josephus.

BOMSTAD (488b) deals critically with the scholarship on the life and character of Josephus and his relationship to the tradition of Hellenistic historiography.

## 9.2: Shorter General Accounts of Josephus' Life and Works in Encyclopedias

- (489) ERWIN NESTLE: Josephus Flavius. In: FRIEDRICH KEPPLER, ed., *Calwer Kirchenlexicon* 1, Stuttgart 1937, p. 967.
- (490) NORMAN BENTWICH: Josephus. In: ALBERT M. HYAMSON and ABRAHAM M. SILBERMANN, edd., *Vallentine's Jewish Encyclopaedia*. London 1938. Pp. 326–327.
- (491) ANONYMOUS: Josephus, Flavius, In: JACOB DE HAAS, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Jewish Knowledge*. New York 1938. Pp. 259–260.
- (492) CHARLES REZNIKOFF: Josephus, Flavius. In: *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* 6, New York 1942, pp. 197–202.
- (493) FELIX A. LEVY: Josephus, Flavius. In: VERGILIUS FERM, ed., *An Encyclopedia of Religion*. New York 1945. P. 400.

- (494) ARNOLD H. M. JONES: Josephus. In: Oxford Classical Dictionary. Oxford 1949. P. 469.
- (495) ARNOLD H. M. JONES and EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: Josephus, Flavius. Oxford Classical Dictionary, 2nd ed., Oxford 1970. P. 565.
- (496) HOLGER MOSBECH: Josephos Flavios. In: AAGE BENTZEN, SVEND HOLM, and N. H. SØE, ed., *Illustreret Religionsleksikon 2*, Skandinavisk Bogforlag 1950, p. 327.
- (497) CECIL ROTH: Josephus, Flavius. In: Chambers's Encyclopaedia 8, New York 1950, p. 138.
- (498) ANONYMOUS: Giuseppe Flavio. In: A. BERNAREGGI, ed., *Enciclopedia Ecclesiastica* 4, Milano 1950, pp. 147–149.
- (499) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: Giuseppe Flavio. In: *Enciclopedia Cattolica* 6, Città del Vaticano 1951, pp. 808–811.
- (500) HANS F. VON CAMPENHAUSEN and ALFRED BERTHOLET, ed.: Josephus. In: *Wörterbuch der Religionen*. Stuttgart 1952. P. 225.
- (501) ANONYMOUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: MADELEINE S. MILLER and J. LANE MILLER, ed., *Harper's Bible Dictionary*. New York 1952; 7th ed., 1961. Pp. 351–352.
- (502) RALPH MARCUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER, ed., *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge: An Extension of the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* 1, Grand Rapids 1955, p. 614.
- (503) GIUSEPPE PRIERO: Giuseppe Flavio. In: ANGELO MERCATI and AUGUSTO PELZER, ed., *Dizionario Ecclesiastico* 2, Torino 1955, pp. 203–204.
- (504) ANONYMOUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: FRANK L. CROSS, ed., *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. London 1957; 2nd ed., 1974. Pp. 745–746.
- (505) RICHARD HENTSCHE: Josephus. In: HEINZ BRUNOTTE and OTTO WEBER, ed., *Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon* 2, Göttingen 1958, pp. 381–382.
- (506) ANONYMOUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: CECIL ROTH, ed., *The Standard Jewish Encyclopedia*. Jerusalem 1958–59. Pp. 1064–1066.
- (507) ANONYMOUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: CECIL ROTH, ed., *Enciclopédia Judaica* 2, Rio de Janeiro 1967, pp. 698–699.
- (509) WERNER FOERSTER: Josephus, Flavius. In: KURT GALLING, ed., *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* 3, 3rd. ed. Tübingen 1959, pp. 868–869.
- (510) JOSEF BLINZLER: Josephus Flavius. In: MICHAEL BUCHBERGER, ed., *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche* 5, 2nd ed. by JOSEF HÖFER and KARL RAHNER, Freiburg 1960, pp. 1141–1143.
- (511) EUGENIUSZ DĄBROWSKI: Józef Flawiusz. In: *Podręczna Encyklopedia Biblijna* 1, Poznań 1960, pp. 611–618.
- (512) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: Josephus, Flavius. In: *The New Bible Dictionary*. London 1962. Pp. 660–661.
- (513) JUDAH GOLDIN: Josephus, Flavius. In: *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 2, New York 1962, pp. 987–988.
- (514) JOHN H. A. HART: Josephus, Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 13, 1962, pp. 152–153.
- (515) HOLGER MOSBECH: Josefos. In: *Svenskt Bibliskt Uppslagsverk* 1, Stockholm 1948, pp. 1125–1126; 2nd ed., Stockholm 1962, pp. 1231–1232.
- (516) ANONYMOUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: C. B. AVERY, ed., *The New Century Classical Handbook*. New York 1962, P. 614.
- (517) WOLFGANG BUCHWALD et al., ed.: Josephus. In: *Tusculum-Lexikon griechischer und lateinischer Autoren des Altertums und des Mittelalters*. München 1963. P. 265.
- (518) SHAILER MATHEWS and WILLIAM R. FARMER: Josephus, Flavius. In: JAMES HASTINGS, *Dictionary of the Bible* (rev. ed. by FREDERICK C. GRANT and HAROLD H. ROWLEY, New York 1963, Pp. 529–530.
- (519) ANONYMOUS: Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: *Encyclopedia Klalit Massada* 4, 1963, pp. 47–48.

- (520) C. GANCHO: Josefo, Flavio. In: *Enciclopedia de la Biblia* 4, Barcelona 1964, pp. 638–641.
- (521) ETHELBERG STAUFFER: Josephus, Flavius. In: BO REICKE and LEONHARD ROST, edd., *Biblich-Historisches Handwörterbuch* 2, Göttingen 1964, p. 890.
- (522) JOSÈPHE DHEILLY: Josèphe (Flavius). In: JOSÈPHE DHEILLY, ed., *Dictionnaire Biblique*. Tournai, Belgium, 1964. Pp. 606–607.
- (523) ANONYMOUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: GAALYAHU CORNFELD, ed., *Pictorial Biblical Encyclopedia*. New York 1964. Pp. 474–475. Trans. into German by GERHARD J. BOTTERWECK. Vol. 1, Bergisch-Gladbach 1969, pp. 852–855.
- (524) SABBAS C. AGOURIDES: Iōsēpos (Phlabios). In: *Thrēskeutikē kai Ēthikē Egkuklopaideia* 7, Athens 1965, pp. 106–109.
- (525) G. BIGARÉ: Josèphe (Flavius). In: G. JACQUEMET, *Catholicisme hier aujourd'hui demain Encyclopédie* 6, Fasc. 25, Paris 1965, pp. 1026–1027.
- (526) TOM B. JONES: Josephus, Flavius. In: *Collier's Encyclopedia* 13, 1965, p. 640.
- (527) RUDOLF MEYER: Josephus, Flavius. In: *Lexikon der Alten Welt*. Zürich 1965. Pp. 1394–1395.
- (528) ANONYMOUS: Josephus. In: JOHN L. MCKENZIE, ed., *Dictionary of the Bible*. Milwaukee 1965. P. 457.
- (529) ANONYMOUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: *The Encyclopedia of the Bible* (trans. from Elseviers *Encyclopedie van de Bijbel*). New York 1965. Pp. 133–134.
- (530) GÜNTER MAYER: Josephus. In: THEODOR KLAUSER, ed., *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, Exegese II (Judentum)* 6, Stuttgart 1966, pp. 1194–1211.
- (531) BERNDT SCHALLER: Iosephos. In: *Der Kleine Pauly, Lexikon der Antike* 2, Stuttgart 1967, pp. 1440–1444.
- (531a) EGIDIUS SCHMALZRIEDT: Iudaïke Archaïologia; Peri tu Iudaïku Polemu. In: *Kindlers Literatur Lexikon* 3, Zürich 1967, pp. 2759–2760; 5, 1969, pp. 1775–1777.
- (532) JOHN STRUGNELL: Josephus, Flavius. In: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7, 1967, pp. 1120–1123.
- (533) ANONYMOUS: Josephus Flavius. In: RAPHAEL J. ZWI WERBLOWSKY and GEOFFREY WIGODER, edd., *The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion*. London 1967. P. 214.
- (534) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: RAPHAEL J. ZWI WERBLOWSKY and GEOFFREY WIGODER, edd., *The Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion*. In: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 26, 1969, pp. 397–406.
- (535) ANONYMOUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: JOHANN F. OPPENHEIMER, ed., *Lexikon des Judentums*. Gütersloh 1967. P. 336.
- (536) GÉRARD NAHON: Flavius Josèphe. In: *Encyclopaedia Universalis* 7, Paris 1968, pp. 34–35.
- (537) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: *Encyclopaedia Hebraica* 19, 1968, pp. 681–690.
- (538) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (539) GARY W. POOLE: Josephus, Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica, Macropaedia*, 10, 1974, pp. 277–278.

NESTLE (489) presents an unsympathetic portrait of Josephus.

BENTWICH (490) is fair but concentrates on Josephus' life rather than on his works.

DE HAAS (491) has a lively but unconvincing article containing a bitter accusation against Josephus as a person.

REZNIKOFF (492) is an unsatisfactory popular account with only one paragraph evaluating Josephus as an historian and only the barest mention of the

relation between Josephus and Halakhah. Its bibliography is very brief and spotty.

LEVY (493) is very brief and unreliable.

JONES (494) has a mere half column, hardly proportionate to other comparable entries in what has become a standard reference work. The revised article by SMALLWOOD (495) remains inordinately brief, with bibliography, properly selective, brought up to date.

MOSBECH (496) is brief, with very little on Josephus' works.

ROTH (497) gives proper attention to Josephus' works as against the details of his political and military activities.

The anonymous article in BERNEREGGI (498) contains a useful summary of modern criticism but a capriciously chosen bibliography.

RICCIOTTI (499) is learned, critical, fair, and undogmatic, but inexplicably omits LAQUEUR from his bibliography.

VON CAMPENHAUSEN and BERTHOLET (500) have a very brief, perfunctory treatment.

The anonymous article in MILLER and MILLER (501) is one of the very poorest treatments of Josephus in an encyclopedia. It is sometimes downright inaccurate.

MARCUS (502) carefully summarizes recent progress in scholarship on Josephus, emphasizing in particular the significance of four advances: 1) the study of the Slavonic version; 2) the study of Josephus' aggadic amplifications of the Bible in the 'Antiquities', including material taken from written Aramaic Targumim; 3) THACKERAY's theory that Josephus employed a Sophoclean assistant for 'Antiquities', Books 15–16, and a Thucydidean assistant for Books 17–19; 4) THACKERAY's evidence that Josephus used a proto-Lucianic text of the Bible for I Samuel through I Maccabees.

PRIERO (503) concentrates on Josephus' works and especially on the 'Testimonium Flavianum'.

The anonymous article in CROSS (504) has a brief, quite undistinguished summary.

HENTSCHE (505) has a factual summary, with a considerable but indiscriminately chosen bibliography.

The anonymous article (506) in the *Standard Jewish Encyclopedia* is very brief and has especially little to say about Josephus' works. This has now been translated into Portuguese (507).

FOERSTER (509) has a good, critical, if relatively brief, article, with a selective but fairly extensive bibliography.

BLINZLER (510) is particularly concerned with Josephus' works and their later influence but has a capriciously selected bibliography.

I am unable to read DĄBROWSKI (511).

BRUCE (512) blithely passes over difficulties or is dogmatic.

GOLDIN (513) has a readable, generally accurate, if undistinguished, entry, with proper balance between Josephus' life and his works.

HART (514) stresses Josephus' political and military roles and has very little about his works, which are, after all, much more important, or about his standing as an historian.

MOSBECH (515) gives a brief account of Josephus' life and works, with stress on his relevance for Jesus and Christianity.

The anonymous entry in AVERY (516) is unusually brief, with very little on Josephus' works.

I am unable to obtain BUCHWALD (517).

MATHEWS and FARMER's (518) article is fairly comprehensive but hardly outstanding.

The anonymous entry in the Encyclopedia Klalit Massada (519) is brief and unimpressive.

GANCHO (520) contains a very brief survey of Josephus' life and works.

STAUFFER (521) properly emphasizes Josephus' works but has an unrepresentative bibliography.

DHEILLY's (522) brief entry is poor, marked by unfairness in its attempt at being critical.

The anonymous article in CORNFELD (523) is one of the best such treatments, emphasizing Josephus' works, fair and balanced in critical evaluation, with attention also to Christian use of Josephus and to Josippon.

AGOURIDES (524) has a good summary but an unselective bibliography.

BIGARÉ's (525) contribution is pedestrian.

JONES' (526) entry is very brief but fair and accurate.

MEYER's (527) article is very brief but competent.

The anonymous entry in MCKENZIE (528) is extraordinarily brief even for such an encyclopedia.

The anonymous entry in 'The Encyclopedia of the Bible' (529) does not even mention the 'Life' and 'Against Apion' among Josephus' works.

I have been unable to obtain MAYER (530).

SCHALLER (531) has a brief but accurate summary of Josephus' life and works, with particular reference to Josephus' sources for various parts of his works, Josephus' influence, and bibliography.

SCHMALZRIEDT (531a) presents summaries of the contents of the 'Antiquities' and of the 'War', together with a discussion of Josephus' sources, the relationship of the 'War' to Greek historiography generally, an appreciation of the literary qualities of the 'Antiquities', an appreciation of the value of the 'War', and a bibliography.

STRUGNELL's (532) article is particularly good for its critical analysis of Josephus' works and of the versions and especially of Josephus' sources.

The anonymous entry in WERBLOWSKY and WIGODER (533) inaccurately states, neglecting the Talmud, that for a long time Josephus was the only source of knowledge of the religious scene at the end of the Second Temple Period. The encyclopedia itself, as I indicate in my extended review (534), is full of inaccuracies.

The anonymous article in OPPENHEIMER (535) is very, very brief and pedestrian.

NAHON (536), in addition to a clear, readable survey of Josephus' life and works, has a brief listing of six key problems in Josephan scholarship which remain to be resolved.

The two most important encyclopedic articles of the period are by SCHALIT (537) (538). The entries are comprehensive and emphasize Josephus' sources and the defects in them. The critical comments, which are frequent, are often controversial; and one wonders whether such idiosyncratic views should be included in encyclopedias which are intended to be standard works. Schalit believes that in general Josephus the writer prevailed over Josephus the historian. The article in the 'Encyclopaedia Judaica' includes a brief, pioneer, anonymous study of Josephus' influence on the arts.

POOLE (539), in the new edition of the 'Encyclopaedia Britannica', has a brief but fair, relatively sympathetic portrait.

### 9.3: Shorter General Accounts of Josephus' Life and Works in Books Other than Encyclopedias

- (540) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: *De Vita et Operibus Flavii Josephi*. In: *Verbum Domini* 18, 1938, pp. 27–30, 57–62.
- (541) JAMES T. SHOTWELL: *The History of History*, 1 (rev. ed. of *An Introduction to the History of History*; New York 1922). New York 1939. Pp. 142–158, with supplement by JOSEPH W. SWAIN.
- (542) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *Josephus' Method in the Presentation of Jewish Antiquities* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 5, 1940, pp. 180–203.
- (543) AHARON KAMINKA: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (544) PINKHOS CHURGIN: *Studies in the Times of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). New York 1949.
- (545) MOSES HADAS: *A History of Greek Literature*. New York 1950. Pp. 237–239.
- (546) TADEUSZ SINKO: *Literatura Grecka*. Vol. 3. Krakow 1951. Pp. 16–36.
- (547) RALPH MARCUS: *Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. In: ABRAHAM MENES, et al., *The Jewish People Past and Present*. Vol. 3. New York 1952. Pp. 40–53.
- (548) RALPH MARCUS: *Josephus*. In his: *Hellenistic Jewish Literature*. In: LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, ed., *The Jews, Their History, Culture, and Religion*. Vol. 2, 3rd ed. New York 1960. Pp. 1086–1090.
- (549) HERMANN BENGTON: *Einführung in die Alte Geschichte*. 2nd ed., München 1953.
- (550) CHARLES K. BARRETT, ed.: *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents*. London 1956.
- (551) MARTIN BRAUN: *The Prophet Who Became a Historian*. In: *The Listener* 56, 1956, pp. 53–57.
- (552) LOUIS A. LAURAND: *Manuel des études grecques et latines*. Paris 1926; rev. ed. (with A. LAURAS) in 2 vols., 1957–60.
- (553) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959.
- (554) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: VICTOR TCHERIKOVER, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. In: *Tradition* 2, 1959–60, pp. 346–350.
- (555) BUNZO AIZAWA: *An Essay on Josephus*. In: *Hirosakidaigaku Jimbun Shakai* (Humanism and Society) no. 19, 1960, pp. 51–83.
- (556) LUIS FARRÉ: *Vida y Obras de Flavio Josefo*. In: *Davar* (Buenos Aires) 84, 1960, pp. 49–55.

- (557) TOBIAH J. TAVYOMI (TUBIAH TAVYOEMY): Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: MOSHE AUERBACH, ed., *Memorial Volume to Yitzhak Isaac Halevy. Part 1. Benei Beraq* 1964. Pp. 306–334.
- (558) NAHUM N. GLATZER: *Anfänge des Judentums; eine Einführung*. Gütersloh 1966.
- (559) ALBIN LESKY: *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. 2nd ed., Bern 1963; 3rd ed., 1971. Trans. into English by JAMES WILLIS and CORNELIS DE HEER: *A History of Greek Literature*. New York 1966.
- (560) ATTILIO MILANO: *Ebrei letterati a Roma nel corso dei secoli*. In: *Studi Romani* 16, 1968, pp. 30–51.
- (561) MICHAEL GRANT: *The Ancient Historians*. London 1970. Pp. 243–268.
- (562) CECIL ROTH: *Historiography: Second Temple Period*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 552–554.
- (563) HARALD HEGERMANN: *Griechisch-jüdisches Schrifttum: Flavius Josephus und Justus von Tiberias*. In: JOHANN MAIER and JOSEF SCHREINER, edd., *Literatur und Religion des Frühjudentums: Eine Einführung*. Würzburg 1973. Pp. 178–180.
- (564) TESSA RAJAK, reviser: *Josephus*. In: EMIL SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*. Revised and edited by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973. Pp. 43–63.
- (565) MENAHEM STERN: *The Greek and Latin Literary Sources*. In: SAMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, in co-operation with DAVID FLUSSER and WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK, *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section 1)*. Assen 1974. Pp. 18–37.
- (565a) LEOPOLD WENGER: *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*. Wien 1953.
- (565b) GAALYAHU CORNFELD and G. JOHANNES BOTTERWECK, edd.: *Pictorial Biblical Encyclopedia*. Tel-Aviv and New York, 1964. Trans. into German by G. JOHANNES BOTTERWECK: *Die Bibel und ihre Welt*, 2 vols. Bergisch-Gladbach 1969.
- (565c) YEHOShUA GUTTMANN and MENAHEM STERN: *From the Babylonian Exile to the Bar Kochba Revolt*. In: DAVID BEN GURION, ed., *The Jews in Their Land*. London 1966. Pp. 104–163.
- (565d) HUGO H. PRELLER: *Geschichte der Historiographie unseres Kulturkreises. Materialien, Skizzen, Vorarbeiten*. Vol. 1. Aalen 1967.
- (565e) FELIX PERLES: *Die jüdisch-griechische Episode*. In: KURT WILHELM, ed., *Wissenschaft des Judentums im deutschen Sprachbereich. Ein Querschnitt I*. Tübingen 1967. Pp. 141–146. (Offprint from: *Der Jude* 4, 1919–20, pp. 176–181).
- (565f) EDUARD LOHSE: *Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*. (Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament, Bd. 1). Göttingen 1971. Trans. into English by JOHN E. STEELY: *The New Testament Environment*. Nashville 1976.
- (565g) JOAN COMAY: *Who's Who in Jewish History, after the Period of the Old Testament*. London 1974.
- (565h) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY, preface: Arnauld d'Andilly, trans., *Flavius Josèphe, Histoire ancienne des Juifs et la guerre des Juifs contre les Romains 66–70 ap. J.-C.* Paris 1973.
- (565i) RUTH JORDAN: *Berenice*. New York 1974.
- (565j) FRANCIS SCHMIDT: *Origines du Christianisme*. In: Paris. *École pratique des hautes Études. Section des sciences religieuses* 83, 1974–75, pp. 228–230.
- (565k) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: *Flavius Josèphe: l'homme, l'écrivain*. In: *Les Dossiers de l'Archéologie*, no. 10, May–June 1975, pp. 54–55.
- (565l) RAYMOND F. SURBURG: *Introduction to the Intertestamental Period*. St. Louis and London 1975.
- (565m) S. RAPPAPORT: *Josephus, Writer of His People's History (in Hebrew)*. In: *Barqai* 44, Sept. 1976, pp. 16–17.
- (565n) RAPHAEL PATAI: *The Jewish Mind*. New York 1977.

- (565o) GÜNTHER STEMBERGER: *Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur. Eine Einführung*. München 1977.
- (565p) PIERRE VIDAL-NAQUET: *Flavius Josèphe ou du bon Usage de la Trahison* (Preface to *La guerre des Juifs*). Paris 1977. Pp. 9–115. Trans. into Italian, with introduction by ARNALDO D. MOMIGLIANO, Roma 1980 (MOMIGLIANO's introduction is reprinted from his 'Ciò che Flavio Giuseppe non vide', in: *Rivista storica Italiana* 91, 1979, pp. 564–574).
- (565q) PAUL GOUKOWSKY: *Flavius Josèphe et le bon usage de la trahison*. In: *Revue des Études grecques* 90, 1977, pp. 88–91.
- (565r) ANDRÉ PAUL: *Bulletin de littérature intertestamentaire. Du Judaïsme ancien au Judéo-Christianisme*. In: *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 66, 1978, pp. 343–387.
- (565s) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *Judaism and Christian Beginnings*. New York 1978.
- (565t) GEZA VERMES: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. Cleveland 1978.
- (565u) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Josephus*. To be published in WILLIAM D. DAVIES and LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, edd., *Cambridge History of Judaism*.
- (565v) GUY NAPHTALI DEUTSCH: *Iconographie de l'illustration de Flavius Josèphe au temps de Jean Fouquet*. Diss., Ph.D., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1978.
- (565w) KARL HOHEISEL: *Das antike Judentum in christlicher Sicht. Ein Beitrag zur neueren Forschungsgeschichte* (Studies in Oriental Religion, 2). Wiesbaden 1978.

I have not seen RICCIOTTI (540), presumably an abbreviated version of the introduction to his translation of Josephus into Italian.

SHOTWELL (541) contains a brief but comprehensive survey of Josephus' qualities as an historian within the ancient historiographical tradition.

HEINEMANN (542) praises Josephus for creating the first book of history that critically covers the history of Israel from the period of the Bible on.

KAMINKA (543) goes too far in denigrating Josephus by saying that he created merely a collection of stories, largely without critical investigation or without the responsibility of an independent investigator.

CHURGIN (544), pp. 274–370, has a careful and extensive, though unoriginal, survey of Josephus' life and works, focussing on the religious spirit of the 'Antiquities' and on the nature of Josephus' reworking of the Bible.

HADAS (545) has a brief, highly readable survey of Josephus' life and works and of his sources, as well as a critical evaluation of Josephus as an historian.

I have not seen SINKO (546).

MARCUS (547) has a general, popular survey of Josephus' life and works, his sources and importance.

In another similar survey MARCUS (548) stresses the importance of the first half of the 'Antiquities' not only as a reliable check on the text of the Septuagint but also as one of the earliest specimens of Jewish Biblical exegesis.

BENGTON (549), pp. 91–92, 104, has an extremely brief summary of Josephus' works (omitting the 'Life' and 'Against Apion') and a very brief annotated bibliography.

BARRETT (550), pp. 190–207, has a biography of Josephus stressing his comments on John, Jesus, and James, and his role as an apologist for Judaism.

BRAUN (551) presents a warm appreciation of Josephus' merit as a storyteller, historian, and theologian. BRAUN well describes Josephus' over-all attitude as historical fatalism, though in practical ethics he stood for free will.



LAURAND (552), vol. 1, p. 375 (revised edition), has the briefest of summaries of Josephus' life and works and of his historical standing, concluding that his literary value is mediocre.

TCHERIKOVER (553) is a translation by SHIMON APPLEBAUM of a revised edition of TCHERIKOVER's Hebrew work, "The Jews and the Greeks in the Hellenistic Age" (Tel Aviv 1930). It is highly critical, perhaps too critical, of Josephus' value as a source. The work is unfortunately marred by a strong anti-theological bias and by an equally strong nationalistic bias. Thus, in the discussion (pp. 160ff.) of the nature of the reforms instituted by Jason the High Priest ('Antiquities', Book 12), which is the heart of TCHERIKOVER's treatment of Hellenistic Palestine, he argues that Jason had no intention of abolishing the Jewish religion, but forgets that the *polis*, and in particular such institutions as the gymnasium, had strong pagan connections. TCHERIKOVER has very full critical accounts of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem (Ant. 11. 304ff.), pp. 42ff.; Antiochus III's documents favoring the Jews (Ant. 12. 138ff.), pp. 82ff.; the reasons for Antiochus Epiphanes' persecution of the Jews (Ant. 12. 234ff.), pp. 175ff.; the reasons why Onias built his temple in Egypt (Ant. 13. 62ff.; War 7. 421–435), pp. 275ff.; the civic rights of the Jews in Alexandria (War 2. 487ff.; Ant., especially Book 14), pp. 309ff. (a particularly sensitive treatment); and the causes of anti-Semitism in Hellenistic times ('Against Apion'), pp. 357ff. I stress the authoritative nature of this work in my review (554).

I have been unable to locate AIZAWA (555), apparently the first treatment of Josephus in Japan.

FARRÉ (556) has an uncritical introduction, with a brief notice of Josephus' life and writings.

TAVYOMI (557) is an uncritical survey, virulent in its attack on Josephus.

GLATZER (558), pp. 76–79, is a general introduction to Josephus and, in particular, to his views of the Jewish religion and polity.

LESKY (559), pp. 859–902 (pp. 900–902 in the third edition, 1971), already a standard work, is disappointingly brief and unincisive in his treatment of Josephus.

MILANO (560), in examining the literary production of the Jews of Rome, says that, in contrast with other ethnic groups in the city, they derived their inspiration from Josephus, whose life and works he briefly summarizes, in taking pride in their culture; but there is no indication that Josephus had any influence on the literary production of Jews anywhere, including Rome, until the Renaissance.

GRANT (561) has a popular, highly readable and balanced survey of Josephus' life and writings.

ROTH (562) correctly stresses that Josephus' great virtue as an historian was his tremendous sweep, though he lacked consistency in giving contradictory accounts of the same events.

HEGERMANN (563) has a brief survey, with emphasis on Josephus' sources.

RAJAK's (564) chapter on Josephus in the newly revised SCHÜRER is a fine, balanced evaluation of Josephus' value as an historian, with emphasis on his sources, and an unusually full treatment of the various versions, especially the Latin.

The latest treatment, that by STERN (565) is the best such general treatment, very well acquainted with the major problems of Josephus and with the secondary literature, and extremely judicious, particularly in its treatment of Josephus' sources.

WENGER (565a), p. 195, summarizes Josephus' life and works and notes the importance of Josephus for the student of law. CORNFELD and BOTTERWECK (565b), 1.852–855 present a general survey of Josephus. GUTTMANN and STERN (565c), p. 155, give a brief account of Josephus' life and works in which they state that Josephus adopted an attitude of reserve toward the Jewish freedom fighters. We may, however, reply that Josephus condemns them roundly, as we see particularly in War 7. 254–274 and Antiquities 18. 4–10. PRELLER (565d), pp. 294–296, has a brief biography of Josephus and summaries of his works, together with a short evaluation of these works and a discussion of their importance. PERLES (565e), pp. 144–145, in a brief, popular essay, discusses the significance of the Judaeo-Greek literature, including Josephus, for the Jewish tradition. He remarks that the Jewish people have not honored his memory, and with good reason, because of his treason. LOHSE (565f), pp. 101–105 (pp. 140–144 in the English translation), gives a short summary of Josephus' life and aims as an historian. COMAY (565g), pp. 229–232, has a popular account of Josephus' life and writings, concluding that though the archaeological finds at Masada and at Jerusalem have proven Josephus to be an accurate guide to topography and structures, he is subject to serious reservations as an historian. NIKIPROWETZKY (565h) surveys the life of Josephus, the importance of his works, and the differences in attitude displayed in them. JORDAN (565i), pp. 178–183, presents a brief summary of Josephus' life and of his middle-of-the-road policy as commander in Galilee. SCHMIDT (565j) refers to an introduction to Josephus at this conference but gives no idea of its contents. PELLETIER (565k) presents a short, popular, dispassionate summary of Josephus' life and works. SURBURG (565l), pp. 161–169, presents an unoriginal introductory summary of Josephus' life and writings, his sources, his historical worth, his Biblical text, his relationship to Hellenism, and his relationship to Christianity. RAPPAPORT (565m) has a brief popular survey. PATAI (565n), pp. 57ff., has a popular account of the meeting of Judaism and Hellenism in the Hellenistic period. He has (pp. 84–85) a brief summary of Josephus' life and works, in which he concludes that Josephus' works as historical sources are invaluable and that they are great historiography written with dramatic force. STEMBERGER (565o), pp. 62–64, presents a brief summary of Josephus' life and works with, in particular, an appreciation of the style of the 'War' and of 'Against Apion'. VIDAL-NAQUET (565p), writing in a lively style, has a summary of the historical period covered by the 'War', of the life and personality of Josephus and especially of the episode at Jotapata, and of the influence of Josephus. He stresses the apocalyptic element in the revolt and the relation of the rebels to the Qumran sect. GOUKOWSKY (565q), in an appre-

ciation of VIDAL-NAQUET (565p), says that he makes good use of Marxist analysis. PAUL (565r), pp. 353–360, in an extended appraisal, stresses the importance of VIDAL-NAQUET.

SANDMEL (565s), pp. 44–50, surveys Josephus' life and works, his motives in writing, his sources, the nature of his embellishments of the Biblical narrative, and his deficiencies, especially the fact that he gives us relatively little information in detail about the inner religious life of the Jews.

VERMES (565t), p. 134, gives a brief summary of the life and works of Josephus.

I (565u) have an extensive summary of Josephus' life and works, the text of Josephus, the versions, bibliographical and lexical aids, and Josephus' influence, with particular attention to the light cast by modern scholarship on crucial questions.

DEUTSCH (565v) surveys Josephus the man and his work, the text tradition of Josephus, Josephus' conception of historiography, and his influence.

HOHEISEL (565w), p. 95, briefly discusses the personality and work of Josephus and concludes that he was strongly influenced by Hellenism.

#### 9.4: Josephus' Conception of Historiography in General

- (566) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: Flavio Giuseppe tradotto a commentato. Vol. 1: Flavio Giuseppe, lo storico Giudeo-Romano. Torino 1937.
- (567) GEORG BERTRAM: Josephus und die abendländische Geschichtsidee. In: WALTER GRUNDMANN, ed., Germanentum, Christentum und Judentum. Vol. 2. Leipzig 1942. Pp. 41–82.
- (568) PHILIP E. HUGHES: The Value of Josephus as a Historical Source. In: *Evangelical Quarterly* 15, 1943, pp. 179–183.
- (569) EMIL SCHÜRER: Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. 3 vols. 3rd ed., Leipzig 1901–9.
- (570) PHILIP E. HUGHES: Josephus as a Historical Source. In: *Religious Digest* 16 (97), 1943, pp. 65–68.
- (571) PAUL COLLOMP: La place de Josèphe dans la technique de l'historiographie hellénistique. In: *Études historiques de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg* (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l'Université de Strasbourg, 106: *Mélanges* 1945, 3: *Études historiques*). Paris 1947. Pp. 81–92. Trans. into German by GÜNTER MAYER in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed., *Zur Josephus-Forschung* (Wege der Forschung, 84). Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 278–293.
- (572) ROBERT L. P. MILBURN: *Early Christian Interpretations of History*. London 1954.
- (573) GERT AVENARIUS: *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*. Meisenheim/Glan 1956.
- (574) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Studies in Josephus*. London 1961.
- (575) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, trans.: *Flavius Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae* (in Hebrew). Vol. 3. Jerusalem 1963.
- (576) MENAHEM STERN: *Flavius Josephus' Method of Writing History* (in Hebrew). In: *Israel Historical Society, ed., Historians and Historical Schools*. Jerusalem 1962. Pp. 22–28.
- (577) A. W. MOSLEY, *Historical Reporting in the Ancient World*. In: *New Testament Studies* 12, 1965–66, pp. 10–26.
- (578) HENRIËTTE BOAS: *Nederlandse Vertalingen van Flavius Josephus door de eeuwen*. In:

- Bijdragen en Mededeelingen van het Genootschap voor de Joodsche Wetenschap in Nederland 8, 1960, pp. 74–76.
- (579) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the *Sefer ha-Kabbalah* with Special Emphasis on Josephus. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 59, 1968–69, pp. 171–214; 60, 1969–70, pp. 37–68, 375–406.
- (580) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius. In: Encyclopaedia Judaica 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (580a) JACK D. SPIRO: A Critical Analysis of Josephus' Approach to the Writing of Jewish History. Unpublished essay, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1957.
- (581) JACK D. SPIRO: Josephus and Colleagues: No Escape from the Mores of the Age. In: Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal 21.3, Summer 1974, pp. 71–79.
- (581a) BERTIL GÄRTNER: The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, 21). Diss., Uppsala 1955.
- (581b) SANTO MAZZARINO: Il pensiero storico classico. Vol. 1. Bari 1966.
- (581c) P. VILLALBA: Aspectos de la historiografía judeo-helenística. In: Boletín del Institut de Estudios helénicos 7, 1973, pp. 111–116.
- (581d) HELGO LINDNER: Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum, Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage. Leiden 1972.
- (581e) HUGH J. SCHONFIELD: The Jesus Party. New York 1974.
- (581f) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller. Franz Delitsch-Vorlesungen 1972. Heidelberg 1978.
- (581g) RAOUL MORTLEY: L'historiographie profane et les pères. In: Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon. Paris 1978. Pp. 315–327.

In antiquity Josephus had a high reputation as an historian and was de-nominated, for example by Jerome (Epistulae ad Eustochium 22. 35, Patrologia Latina 22. 421) a second Livy, was termed φιλαληθής by the fifth-century Isidore of Pelusium (Epist. 4. 75) and by the tenth-century Suidas (s.v. Ἰώσηπος), and was called *diligentissimus et φιλαληθέστατος* by the sixteenth-century scholar JOSEPH SCALIGER in the preface to his 'De Emendatione Temporum'.

In the period under review Josephus has fared less well. RICCIOTTI (566) cites numerous examples to support his charge that Josephus is at times prejudiced and at other times careless and obtuse.

BERTRAM's (567) attack upon him as a propagandist who attempted to show Judaism's primacy in world history and to infuse the Hellenistic world with Jewish thoughts is, unfortunately, marred by blatant anti-Semitism. BERTRAM laments the immense influence on Western historiography of so biased and inaccurate an historian.

HUGHES (568), in a balanced statement highly dependent upon SCHÜRER (569), shifts between praise and blame of Josephus as an historian, and argues that of Josephus' works the most trustworthy as an historical document is undoubtedly the 'War'; but one must qualify such a statement by noting that for those events in the 'War' where Josephus was himself involved, he is highly suspect. HUGHES takes Josephus at his word when Josephus says he used a given source; but very often when an ancient writer cites a source it is a good assumption that he did not use it but should have used it. A popular general survey of this article has also appeared (570).

The one article, that by COLLOMP (571), which seriously attempts to place Josephus within the Hellenistic historiographical tradition must be termed a

disappointment. He asserts that Josephus, while close to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, claims to be different from and superior to him. COLLOMP notes that in theory Josephus is the declared enemy of the rhetorical in history; but he takes too seriously Josephus' attacks on Greek historiography in 'Against Apion', which is, after all, a polemical work; and there is little warrant for COLLOMP's conclusion that Josephus comes very near Polybius in his condemnation of those who disregard the truth.

MILBURN (572), pp. 9–10, compares Josephus with Thucydides and Polybius and concludes that despite his professions of accuracy Josephus falls far below the standards of strictest precision.

In an important study AVENARIUS (573) shows that Lucian's 'Quomodo historia conscribenda sit' is a collection of historiographical commonplaces, many derived from Isocratean rhetoric; the fact that so many are found in Josephus clearly indicates that he is a part of this tradition.

SHUTT (574) seems hardly justified in calling Josephus a Jewish Thucydides, though SCHALIT (575), p. viii, goes too far in condemning him categorically for lacking a precise and critical faculty.

STERN (576) has a judicious general survey, focussing in particular on Josephus' use of his sources.

MOSLEY (577), pp. 23–24, noting that Josephus criticizes inaccurate reporting of events, decides that Josephus is reliable; but such criticisms of other historians is itself a commonplace, as AVENARIUS has conclusively shown.

BOAS (578) summarizes the views of Dutch scholars on Josephus' qualities as an historian.

ZEITLIN (579) properly concludes that Josephus' statement of facts is reliable but that his interpretation of the facts is subjective.

SCHALIT (580) accuses Josephus of evading or shrouding in obscurity his own reprehensible actions and of whitewashing Titus and Vespasian. He stresses that instead of admitting his incompetence on the battlefield Josephus resorts to boasting based on obvious lies. He notes that Tacitus, though manifestly anti-Jewish, gives an entirely different picture of the war, portraying it as a national rebellion rather than as the work of a few thugs. But, we may comment, Tacitus, too, has an axe to grind, since by stressing the complete participation of the whole people he magnifies the Roman victory. SCHALIT concludes that it is very probable that Josephus decided to write the history of the Jewish War because he was subject to the wishes and obliged to support the political aims of the Emperor Vespasian, who felt uneasy as a *novus homo* and wanted to warn his enemies; but this view, we may remark, is contrary to what Josephus himself says in the prooemium to the 'War'. If it were true or even rumored, one would expect that Justus of Tiberias would mention it in his attack on Josephus, and there is no evidence that he did so, inasmuch as Josephus does not reply to it in the 'Life'. On the contrary, Josephus (Life 358) boasts that he had perused Titus' 'Commentaries', whereas Justus had not, an argument that would be playing into Justus' hands if he had been accused of writing the history through the Emperor's instigation.

I have not seen SPIRO (580a).

SPIRO (581), who is an apologist for Josephus, says, in a popular article, that the true way of judging an historian is by viewing him in his own world, not beyond it, and that by this standard Josephus is no worse than Tacitus and other historians of Greece and Rome who proclaimed that they would adhere to the truth and then proceeded to doctor it.

GÄRTNER (581a), pp. 18–26, comments in general on historical writing in the books of Maccabees and in Josephus, remarking that Josephus as a historian does not follow his own advice, since he succumbs to rhetoric in his propagandistic tendency. As a rule, he concludes, Josephus is faithful to his sources, but the elaboration of the material is his own. He cites *Antiquities* 12. 279ff., which is a paraphrase of I Maccabees 2. 49–69, as an example, though he notes that the distance between Josephus and Luke is greater than that between Josephus and I and II Maccabees.

MAZZARINO (581b), pp. 8ff., discusses the place of the 'War' in Greek historiography.

VILLALBA (581c) states five criteria which Hellenistic historians, including Josephus, employed as methodological bases for their work: the presence of the author as direct witness of the deed which he relates, objectivity and impartiality, a critical faculty, research, and love of truth.

LINDNER (581d) carefully discusses the theological basis of Josephus' historiography, noting that Josephus conforms both to Hellenistic and Jewish principles of historiography, particularly in his view of the role of *τύχη*. But, we may comment, LINDNER is less thorough in considering Josephus' place in Hellenistic historiography as compared to that of Philo, Nicolaus of Damascus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Diodorus.

SCHONFIELD (581e), pp. 36–38, commenting on Josephus' general qualities as a historian, concludes that when Josephus had no detailed sources at his disposal he left great gaps and compensated by devoting far too much space to matters having little bearing on his theme; we may here suggest as an example of this his extended excursus on the assassination of Caligula and the accession of Claudius in Book 19 of the '*Antiquities*'.

VAN UNNIK (581f) comments on Josephus' significance and laments the neglect of his works in recent scholarship – surely a charge that is difficult to sustain, as the multiplicity of works cited in the present review indicates – and stresses his importance for New Testament studies.

MORTLEY (581g) discusses Hellenistic ethnography as a theory of acculturation. He notes that Josephus is conscious of the relative lack of interest in Jewish history among the Greek writers. We may comment that such lack of interest in the Jews is quite understandable in view of the fact that, from a Greek standpoint, the Jews had contributed nothing significant to philosophy, science, or the arts – the areas which constituted to them the most important indications of the greatness of a civilization.

## 10: Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible

### 10.0: Josephus' Treatment of the Biblical Period: the Problem of Josephus' Modifications of the Bible Generally

- (582) JOHANN FABRICIUS: *Historia bibliothecae Fabricianae*. Part 2. Wolfenbüttel 1718. Pp. 386–396.
- (583) JOHANN G. CARPZOV: *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti*. Pars III: Circa pseudo-criticam GUIL. WHISTONI, sollicita, denuo recognita, hinc inde aucta et indicibus necessariis instructa, secunda vice edita. Leipzig 1728. Trans. into English with additional notes by MOSES MARCUS: A Defense of the Hebrew Bible, in answer to the charge of corruption brought against it by Mr. WHISTON, in his Essay towards restoring the true text of the Old Testament, etc. London 1729.
- (584) GUSTAV TACHAUER: *Das Verhältniss von Flavius Josephus zur Bibel und Tradition*. Erlangen 1871.
- (585) JACOB HAMBURGER: Josephus Flavius. In his: *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*. Abteilung 2. Strelitz 1883 (3rd ed. 1896), Pp. 502–510.
- (586) BENEDICTUS NIESE: Der jüdische Historiker Josephus. In: *Historische Zeitschrift* 40, 1896, pp. 193–227. English trans. in: JAMES HASTINGS, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* 7, 1914, pp. 569–579.
- (587) HEINZ SCHECKER: Die Hellenisierung des Hexateuchs in der Archäologie des Josephus. In: *Verhandlungen der 55. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner* 1925 (Leipzig 1926), p. 54.
- (588) JOSHUA GUTMANN: Josephus Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 9, Berlin 1932, pp. 394–420.
- (589) SALOMO RAPPAPORT: *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus*. Wien 1930.
- (590) ALGERNON J. POLLOCK: *Josephus and the Bible*. London 1947.
- (591) BOIAN PIPEROV: Flavius und sein Verhältnis zu den alttestamentlichen Schriften (Bulg., Deutsche Zfg.). In: *Godišnik na Duchovnata Akademija 'sv. Kliment Ochridski'* 38, Sofia 1962, pp. 219–247.
- (592) CARL SIEGFRIED: Die hebräischen Worterklärungen des Josephus. In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 3, 1883, pp. 32–52.
- (593) GERT AVENARIUS: *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*. Meisenheim/Glan 1956.
- (594) HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE: *The Presentation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., Ph. D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1975. Publ. as: *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Missoula, Montana 1976.
- (595) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (596) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: De la Règle μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'Histoire du Canon. In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 3, 1949, pp. 1–36.
- (596a) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller*. Heidelberg 1978.

- (597) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (598) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Hellenizations in Josephus' Portrayal of Man's Decline. In: *Studies in the History of Religions* 14 (Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough, ed. JACOB NEUSNER). Leiden 1968. Pp. 336–353.
- (599) NIGEL AVIGAD and YIGAEEL YADIN: *A Genesis Apocryphon*. Jerusalem 1956.
- (600) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Prolegomenon. In: MONTAGUE R. JAMES, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. New York 1971. Pp. vii–clxix.
- (601) RENÉÉ BLOCH: Midrash. In: *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplement 5, 1957, pp. 1263–1281. Trans. into English by W. S. GREEN, ed.: *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice* (Brown Judaic Studies, 1). Missoula, Mont. 1978. Pp. 29–50.
- (601a) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: Die Formel 'nichts wegnehmen, nichts hinzufügen' bei Josephus. In his: *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller*. Heidelberg 1978. Pp. 26–40.
- (601b) LESTER L. GRABBE: Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography. In: PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, vol. 2. Missoula, Mont. 1979. Pp. 43–68.
- (601c) TESSA RAJAK: *Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World*. Diss., 2 vols., Oxford 1974.

In *Antiquities* 1. 17 Josephus says that he will set forth the “precise details” (τὰ ἀκριβῆ) of what is written in the Scriptures (ἀναγραφαῖς), “neither adding nor omitting anything” (οὐδὲν προσθεῖς οὐδ’ αὖ παραλιπών). His work, he says, has been translated (μεθηρομηνευμένην) from the Hebrew records (ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν . . . γραμμάτων).

FABRICIUS (582) had already prepared a list of ‘errors’ made by Josephus, especially in his paraphrase of the Bible in the first half of the ‘Antiquities’. CARPZOV (583), in his refutation of WHISTON, similarly lists many instances where Josephus diverges from the text of Scripture, whether from ignorance of Hebrew or of set purpose. Many scholars, such as TACHAUER (584) (not always accurate, often uncritical, and poorly arranged), HAMBURGER (585), NIESE (586), SCHECKER (587) (a mere summary of a paper, the full form of which has never been published), GUTMANN (588) (who has a brief summary but an extensive bibliography), and RAPPAPORT (589) (the fullest treatment, but often forced in its attempt to find rabbinic parallels, and, in any case, with numerous omissions) have noted the changes, often major, made by Josephus in his version of Scripture. (I have not seen POLLOCK [590] and PIPEROV [590], which presumably deal with this theme).

To say, as does SIEGFRIED (592), pp. 32–33, n. 3, that Josephus’ assurance that he has not added to or subtracted from the Biblical text is dependent upon the ignorance of his readers, since, as he puts it, every page of the ‘Antiquities’ shows this to be a lie, is unsatisfactory, because the Jews of the Diaspora certainly knew the Septuagint, which they believed to be divinely inspired and which differs drastically in many places from Josephus’ paraphrase.

One solution that has been offered to this apparent contradiction between Josephus’ statement and his practice by AVENARIUS (593), ATTRIDGE (594), and COHEN (595) is that the phrase “neither adding nor omitting anything” is a traditional and meaningless technique of affirming one’s accuracy, as we see earlier in the first century in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Thucydides 5 (μήτε προστι-



θέντες . . . μήτε ἀφαιροῦντες) and Thucydides 8 (οὔτε προστιθεὶς οὔτε ἀφαιρῶν), and in the second-century Lucian, *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit* 47 (ἢ ἀφαιρήσειν ἢ προσθήσειν).

COHEN also suggests that it was customary for writers (e.g. Berossus, Philo Byblus, Ctesias, Hecataeus of Abdera), whether Hellenized Orientals or Greeks, to claim that their account was but a translation of sacred texts. But, we may reply, the Septuagint was certainly widely known in the Greek-speaking Diaspora; and any reader thereof would immediately object to Josephus' claim of fidelity by noting the numerous changes, many of major importance.

We may note, however, that the phrase 'neither adding nor omitting anything' need not have been taken from a source such as Dionysius, since the Septuagint for Deuteronomy 4. 2 renders *lo' tosifu* . . . *velo' tigere'u* as οὐ προσθήσετε οὐκ ἀφελεῖτε, and similarly the Septuagint for Deuteronomy 12. 32 (Hebrew text, 13. 1) renders *lo' tosef* . . . *velo' tigera'* as οὐ προσθήσεις . . . οὐδὲ ἀφελείς, the verbs used by Josephus in *Against Apion* 1. 42, where he says that for long ages no one has ventured either to add (προσθεῖναι) or to remove (ἀφελεῖν) or to alter (μεταθεῖναι) anything in Scripture. Similarly Josephus may have derived the formula from the 'Letter of Aristee' (308–311) which invokes a curse upon anyone who should alter the text by adding, modifying, or omitting anything.

Another possibility is that Josephus understood the phrase prohibiting addition or subtraction in the sense to which the Rabbis apparently limited it, namely Halakhically. In that case, we might explain Josephus' divergences from Halakhah by postulating that he represents an earlier Halakhah or a minority point of view which did not prevail by the time that the Oral Torah was codified.

VAN UNNIK (596) traces the statement and restatement of this formula in Josephus and throughout early Christian literature, without, however, discussing the fact that both Josephus and the Christian writers contradict themselves by adding to and subtracting from the Biblical narrative. VAN UNNIK (596a) also has a discussion of this formula in his German work.

As students of the Septuagint know, many changes were made, despite the curse, so that Jerome in the fourth century already knows three major recensions of the Septuagint. But these modifications are generally minor verbal changes, whereas those introduced by Josephus are often major. HÖLSCHER (597) had argued that Josephus' version of the Bible, with its frequent divergences and excursions, is based upon a Hellenistic midrashic-like paraphrase, presumably like Philo's treatises and similar to JACOB BEN ISAAC ASHKENAZI's seventeenth-century 'Ze'enah Ure'enah'; but while there are occasional parallels between Josephus and Artapanus, Eupolemus, and Philo, there is no evidence that such a work existed, let alone that Josephus used it.

I have suggested (598), pp. 336–337, that Josephus includes in 'Scriptures' (ἀναγραφαῖς) not only the written Bible but Jewish tradition generally. This would imply that some of the Midrashic tradition had by Josephus' time been committed to writing; and while such a statement two decades ago would have been considered most unlikely, inasmuch as the earliest rabbinic midrashim

date from a century after Josephus, we now have midrashim in the Dead Sea Scrolls, notably the 'Genesis Apocryphon', dated by its editors AVIGAD and YADIN (599), p. 38, on palaeographic grounds, as having been written between the end of the first century B.C.E. and the middle of the first century C.E., which Josephus parallels at several points. To this we may add the midrashim in Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', a work almost exactly contemporary with Josephus' 'Antiquities', as I note in my 'Prolegomenon' (600), pp. xxviii–xxxi. In fact, as BLOCH (601) has brilliantly shown, the origins of midrash are to be found in certain books of the Bible itself.

The rabbis, of course, were keenly aware of the prohibition in Deuteronomy of adding to or subtracting from Scripture, and yet, just as in the realm of Halakhah they do so on the basis of Deuteronomy 17. 11 ("According to the law which they [i.e., the judges, understood by the rabbis to mean the authorities in every generation] shall teach thee, . . . thou shalt do"), so in the realm of Biblical narrative they prescribe (Megillah 25a–b) that certain passages be omitted from translation because of the embarrassment involved and insist on many far-reaching midrashic narratives as part of the oral tradition going back to Sinai itself. The rabbis themselves (Megillah 9a–b), moreover, sanctioned a number of changes made by the seventy-two elders as being divinely inspired. Rabbi Judah the Prince in the second century remarks (Tosefta, Megillah 4 (3). 41) that whoever translates a Biblical verse literally is an impostor and that whoever adds thereto is a blasphemer; apparently there is a tradition as to how a given Biblical verse is to be understood, and this should not be tampered with.

COHEN (595) objects to my interpretation by noting that Against Apion 1. 42, after enumerating the written canon of the Scriptures, says that no one for long ages has ventured to add or remove or alter anything in them, and that, in fact, every Jew has been ready to die for them. This, we may comment, may well apply to the written Scriptures, but it does not apply to the oral Torah, for which, indeed, Jews were also ready to lay down their lives, as we see in the pages of Josephus. Moreover, in Antiquities 1. 17 Josephus says that he will transmit the precise details of the Scriptures, using the term ἀναγγραφαίς; in Against Apion 1. 43 he says that no one dares to utter a single word against the laws (νόμους) and the allied documents (τὰς μετὰ τούτων ἀναγγραφάς), apparently distinguishing between ἀναγγραφαί and νόμοι.

VAN UNNIK (601a), after examining the formula 'neither adding nor omitting anything' in Josephus (Ant. 1. 17) and in other Greek historians, concludes that it is not to be taken literally, but that it means merely that the truthfulness of the source is assured and that it has not been falsified because of prejudice. A similar formula, it may be noted, is to be found in the Talmud, Shabbath 116b, where a nameless 'philosoph' quotes from the end of a nameless book, presumably a Gospel, containing a passage akin to Matthew 5. 17, that "I came not to destroy the Law of Moses nor to add to the Law of Moses."

GRABBE (601b), *passim*, comments on Josephus' Biblical chronology and on his synchronism with Greek history. In particular, he remarks on Josephus' statement (Ant. 1. 13, Ap. 1. 1) that the world is about 5000 years old and on its relation to rabbinic statements and to those of Justus of Tiberias.

RAJAK (601c), which I have not seen, has an extended treatment of Josephus and his Greek Bible.

### 10.1: The Nature of Josephus' Modifications of the Bible in General

- (602) ALFRED EDERSHEIM: Josephus. In: WILLIAM SMITH and HENRY WACE, ed., A Dictionary of Christian Biography 3, London 1882, pp. 441–460.
- (603) CECIL ROTH: Historiography: Second Temple Period. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 552–554.
- (604) HEINZ SCHECKER: Die Hellenisierung des Hexateuchs in der Archäologie des Josephus. In: *Verhandlungen der 55. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner 1925* (Leipzig 1926), p. 54.
- (605) LOUIS GINZBERG: *Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia 1909–38.
- (606) BERNHARD HELLER: Ginzberg's *Legends of the Jews*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 24, 1933–34, pp. 175–184.
- (607) BERNHARD HELLER: Die Scheu vor Unbekanntem. Unbenanntem in Agada und Apokryphen. In: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 83, 1939, pp. 170–184.
- (608) ISAAC HEINEMANN: Josephus' Method in the Presentation of Jewish Antiquities (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 5, 1940, pp. 180–203.
- (609) ISAAC HEINEMANN: The Methods of the Aggadah (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1949–50; 2nd ed., 1954; 3rd ed., 1970.
- (610) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, trans.: *Flavius Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae* (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Jerusalem 1944.
- (611) WILHELM RUDOLPH: Der Wettstreit der Leibwächter des Darius 3 Esr 3. 1–5. 6. In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 61, 1945–48, pp. 176–190.
- (612) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, ed., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (613) AARON MIRSKY: Biblical Explanations in the *Jewish Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 22, 1948, pp. 282–287.
- (614) PINKHOS CHURGIN: *Studies in the Times of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). New York 1949.
- (615) GÉZA VERMÈS: *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. Leiden 1961.
- (616) GÉZA VERMÈS: Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis. In: PETER R. ACKROYD and CHRISTOPHER F. EVANS, ed., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 1: From the Beginnings to Jerome. Cambridge 1970. Pp. 199–231.
- (617) RONALD B. SOBEL: Josephus' Conception of History in Relationship to the Pentateuch as a Source of Historical Data. Unpublished M.A. rabbinical thesis. Hebrew Union College. Cincinnati 1962 (microfilm).
- (618) NAOMI G. COHEN: Josephus and Scripture: Is Josephus' Treatment of the Scriptural Narrative Similar throughout the Antiquities I–XI? In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 54, 1963–64, pp. 311–332.
- (619) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Hellenizations in Josephus' Version of Esther. In: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 101, 1970, pp. 143–170.
- (620) ADDISON G. WRIGHT: An Investigation of the Literary Form, Haggadic Midrash, in the Old Testament and Intertestamental Literature. Diss., Catholic University, Washington 1965.
- (621) ADDISON G. WRIGHT: The Literary Genre Midrash. In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 28, 1966, pp. 105–138, 417–457.
- (622) ADDISON G. WRIGHT: *The Literary Genre Midrash*. New York 1967.

- (623) RENÉE BLOCH: Midrash. In: Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement 5, 1957, pp. 1263–1281. Trans. into English by W. S. GREEN, ed.: Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice (Brown Judaic Studies, 1). Missoula, Mont. 1978. Pp. 29–50.
- (624) HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE: The Presentation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Ph. D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1975. Publ. as: The Interpretation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Missoula, Montana 1976.
- (625) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (626) GERT AVENARIUS: Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung. Meisenheim/Glan 1956.
- (626a) MARTIN HENGEL: Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und "literarische Fälschung" in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur. In: Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, vol. 18: Pseudepigrapha. Fondation Hardt, Vandoeuvres-Genève 1972. Pp. 229–308, 309–329 (discussion).
- (626b) CARL R. HOLLADAY: *Theios Aner* in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology. Diss., Yale University, New Haven 1974. Publ.: Missoula, Montana 1977.
- (626c) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Hellenism and Judaism. In: STANLEY M. WAGNER and ALLEN D. BRECK, edd., Great Confrontations in Jewish History (University of Denver, The J. M. Goodstein Lectures on Judaica, 1975). Denver 1977. Pp. 21–38.
- (626d) DAVID DAUBE: Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric. In: Hebrew Union College Annual 22, 1949, pp. 239–264.
- (626e) MARTIN HENGEL: Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr. Tübingen 1969; 2nd ed. 1973. Trans. into English by JOHN BOWDEN: Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period. 2 vols. Philadelphia 1974.

The extent of Josephus' knowledge of the Jewish midrashic tradition has been subject to considerable debate. EDELSHEIM (602) concludes that his knowledge was only superficial, that he was acquainted merely with the views that were currently popular in Jerusalem, that he lacked deeper and more accurate erudition, and that he did not scruple to modify these traditions as suited his purpose. But inasmuch as so many midrashim are lost, such a judgment seems premature, to say the least. In any case, contrary to the view of ROTH (603) that the 'Antiquities' adds nothing to our known factual knowledge of the Biblical period, the truth is that for some details Josephus uses important non-Biblical sources, particularly for the period of the kings.

Unfortunately only a summary of SCHECKER's (604) paper was ever published. To judge from this, however, he concluded that the 'Antiquities' was a λόγος πολιτικός in three senses: 1) It is a presentation of a πολιτεία to educate mankind, with the method of raising children (following Dionysius of Halicarnassus' account of Roman rigorousness) and the goals of man's development so presented as to be welcome also to Stoics; 2) The work is directed to the ruler, who is to follow the model of the σωτήρ, who mediates between the strictness of the νόμοι and the needs of weak humanity; 3) It is a synthesis of Stoic rationalism and of the late Greek novel. Whether SCHECKER would have been able to sustain these theses is highly problematic since, while it is true that Josephus praises the Stoics, comparing the Pharisees to them (Life 12), he specif-

ically (Ant. 1. 5) directs the work to the entire Greek-speaking world and not merely to statesmen as a Thucydidean-like handbook; and the apologetic motifs are too numerous and too prominent to be disregarded.

No work presents the additions and modifications of Josephus in as complete and careful perspective compared to the rabbinic material, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, Philo, Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', and the Church Fathers as does GINZBERG (605). The work, however, is not absolutely systematic, and many individual items, though few of any importance, escape the author. HELLER (606), in an analysis of Josephus' treatment of the Bible as noted by GINZBERG, cites certain pervasive characteristics, namely those of the priest, the aggadist, the Hellenist, and the apologist, but he admits that there are some that are due merely to the individual peculiarities of Josephus himself.

One of the characteristics of Josephus is that he often gives precise names to characters nameless in the Bible (one may add also that he sometimes gives precise numbers where the Bible is indefinite). HELLER (607) notes parallels in rabbinic, apocryphal, and pseudepigraphical writings, concluding that Josephus stands on the boundary between rabbinic aggada and the Apocrypha. He inexplicably, however, omits Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', the closest parallel in time and often in detail to Josephus and neglects the comparison with this practice in such authors as Theopompus and Plutarch and the possibility that Josephus may have derived it from current Hellenistic practice.

HEINEMANN (608) (609), pp. 45–46, 145–146, comparing Josephus with other Palestinian and Diaspora Haggadists, presents a brief survey of Josephus' Hellenizations, noting that Josephus is apologetic, that he employs the methods of the great Greek historians, notably Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and that he follows the canons of Hellenistic historiography.

SCHALIT (610), in his introduction to volume 1, p. xxxvi, raising the question as to how much of the oral tradition of the Bible Josephus knew, rightly points out that, according to the Jerusalem Talmud (Megillah 3. 1), higher Talmudic learning was widely diffused in Jerusalem; and presumably Josephus did not depart from the norm, especially since he came of such distinguished ancestry. SCHALIT even argues that in Rome Josephus had an opportunity to deepen his knowledge of the Jewish tradition, since his life was devoted to such studies and he could meet with scholars such as Mattiah ben Ḥeresh. But we have no evidence that he did meet with such scholars, unless we identify him with the nameless philosopher whom Joshua ben Ḥananiah and the other sages met in Rome (Derekh Erez Rabbah 5). In view of the fact that Josephus was suspect because of his dealings with Titus, against whom the rabbis were so bitter (cf., e.g., Giṭṭin 56b–57a), and because of his interest in and knowledge of Greek literature, the dangers of which the rabbis repeatedly recognized (Sotah 49b, Baba Kamma 82b, Menaḥoth 64b), it would be surprising if Josephus stood in the good graces of the rabbis. The fact remains that throughout the huge Talmudic corpus he is never mentioned by name even once. As for a possible relationship between Josephus and Mattiah ben Ḥeresh, the latter did not leave the land of Israel until after the fall of Bethar in 135 (Sifre Deuteronomy 80), a full generation after Josephus' death. When he came to Puteoli in

Italy, he and his fellow-scholars returned to Israel. He did not finally settle in Rome and establish his great yeshivah there until later.

RUDOLPH (611), p. 177, n. 1, revives HÖLSCHER's (612) theory, pp. 1955–1960, that for the 'Antiquities' Josephus used neither the Hebrew nor the Greek Bible but rather secondary materials akin to the histories written by the Jewish Hellenistic writers such as Artapanus and Eupolemus, who were familiar with Alexandrian Jewish traditions. But it seems hard to believe that Josephus, who was certainly well educated and probably, in accordance with the ways of the time, knew much of the Bible by heart, did not also resort to direct use of the Bible.

MIRSKY (613) attempts to show that passages in Josephus which apparently contradict the Bible really do not. He says that the text of the Bible during this period varied from town to town, and cites examples where Josephus merely supplements the Biblical text, notably in *Antiquities*, Book 5, as compared with the Books of Joshua and Judges.

CHURGIN (614), pp. 274–370, in his survey of Josephus' life and works, focusses particularly on Josephus' relationship to the Bible and to his other sources. He cites many examples of Josephus' changes in his rendering of the Bible but seldom engages in analysis of Josephus' motives for these changes.

VERMÈS (615), who develops an historical approach to exegetical tradition, presents a number of sample studies, namely, the life of Abraham (*Ant.* 1. 151 ff.), the binding of Isaac (*Ant.* 1. 222–236), and the story of Balaam (*Ant.* 4. 102 ff.), comparing the accounts of Josephus with those of Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, the Targumim, and midrashim, and stressing Josephus' similarity to the rest of the Palestinian tradition. He fails, however, to consider Josephus' process of Hellenization for its own sake and the individual element in Josephus.

VERMÈS (616), pp. 206–208, 217–220, 228–230, presents a useful summary of Josephus as an interpreter of the Bible.

SOBEL (617) has attempted to list all of Josephus' divergences from the first five books of the Bible, but his list is very incomplete. Moreover, he has relied upon THACKERAY's translation in the Loeb Library to the exclusion of the Greek, has made little attempt to explain these differences, and has failed to consider the Greek influences working upon Josephus.

COHEN (618) attempts to show that in the first five books of the 'Antiquities' covering through 1 Samuel 4, Josephus is much freer in vocabulary, style, order, and content in his rendering of the Biblical material than he is in Books 6–11. In particular, the genealogies have been paraphrased in Greek style, the narratives embellished with long speeches, and with much material added from non-Biblical sources. It is certainly striking that, for example, as Cohen shows, the word ἀποσημαίνω, "to report," appears only once in the Septuagint, twenty-five (actually twenty-eight) times in *Antiquities* 1–5, not at all in *Antiquities* 6–14, eighteen (actually nineteen) times in *Antiquities* 15–19, and not at all in *Antiquities* 20. Her method is to take one sample selection from each book – *Antiquities* 1. 148–150, 2. 150, 3. 150, 4. 150–151, 5. 150–151, 6. 150–152, 7. 149–150, 8. 150–151, 9. 149–150, 10. 149–150 – and to

determine how closely Josephus adheres to the Hebrew and Greek texts. She concludes that in Books 1–5 the material has been entirely recast with the aim of bringing the Biblical narrative into conformity with the style and psychology of the Greek novel. But COHEN does not consider the possibility that Josephus used a Targum which may be very close to or very far from the Hebrew original. Moreover, Josephus' version of Esther, which occurs in Book 11 of the 'Antiquities', as I (619) have tried to show, is very much in accordance with the spirit of the Greek novel. In addition, while it is true that in content Antiquities 1–5 is freer than 6–11, in text it is closer to the Septuagint. COHEN concludes, like HÖLSCHER, that Josephus' source is a Hellenistic midrash more highly developed for the Pentateuch (as our Midrashim and Philo are, we may add) than for the rest of the Bible, and that Josephus is answering anti-Semites, who drew primarily upon the Pentateuch. But we need not postulate a Hellenistic midrash as Josephus' source, since almost all of Josephus' major modifications are paralleled in rabbinic midrash, and since we by no means have all the rabbinic midrashim, whence it is fair to assume that those which are not paralleled may well be among the lost midrashim (some of which we may recover from Church Fathers such as Jerome, who was intimately acquainted with midrashic tradition). The fact that Josephus is fuller in his additions to the Pentateuch than he is in the rest of the Bible is paralleled by the rabbinic literature and Philo, which similarly is peculiarly full here, presumably because it was the Torah which was read and expounded each week in the synagogues.

WRIGHT's (620) dissertation has appeared substantially in two articles (621), later reprinted as a book (622). He argues that Josephus' literary form is not midrash but rather that of a history of the Jewish people, that he does not indicate in his preface any intention of interpreting the Bible but states explicitly that he is writing a history. The Biblical material utilized by Josephus is not looked upon as an object to be clarified, interpreted, or made relevant, but rather as a source from which to quarry material. In summary, Josephus does not intend his work as a contribution to the understanding of the Bible, but rather it is the Bible which contributes to the understanding of Josephus' work. If, with WRIGHT, who derives it from BLOCH (623), we define midrash as a work that attempts to explain a text of Scripture, this is not, we must admit, the purpose or method of Josephus, though indirectly Josephus certainly does do this. In his apologetic concern, however, Josephus surely is interested in making the Bible relevant to his generation, an aim that WRIGHT admits is a major goal of midrash. In any case, WRIGHT's attempt to exclude Josephus from the category of midrash on technical grounds is to separate Jewish literary works into rigid categories akin to those applicable to Greco-Roman literature, whereas the lines are definitely more blurred in Judaism. Why not say that the midrashim may at times be regarded separately from the Biblical text upon which they are based?

ATTRIDGE (624), refuting HÖLSCHER's (612) theory that Josephus is merely a mechanical copyist who simply reproduced a variety of earlier sources, shows that he has a consistent and continuous reflection of the events of Biblical history and concludes that this is the work of Josephus himself, who, under the

influence of the antiquarian approach of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, adopted the conventions of a very different style of historiography in the 'Antiquities' from that used in the 'War'. HÖLSCHER's answer to this, we may suggest, might be that the consistency is to be explained by the fact that Josephus was relying upon a single paraphrase for the whole period.

COHEN (625) perceptively notes that in his rearrangement of the Biblical material Josephus follows the 'thematic' school, in accordance with the Hellenistic historical tradition, as noted by AVENARIUS (626), pp. 119–127; that is, he brings into juxtaposition the items which belong together on the basis of subject, regardless of chronology or source. COHEN cites a number of examples from the first half of the 'Antiquities', for example, Josephus' connection of the genealogies of Noah, Ham, and Canaan (1. 130–142), which are separated in the Bible. Again, unlike the Book of Chronicles, which quotes extensively from the other historical books of the Bible, Josephus stands in the Greek tradition in that in his paraphrase he generally changes considerably the language and style of his source.

HENGEL (626a), pp. 246–249, presents a brief, uncritical survey of elements of romance in Josephus' reworking of the Bible and of his citations of anonymous and pseudonymous authors.

HOLLADAY (626b), pp. 67–78, offers a survey of Josephus' presentation of Moses, Abraham, Joseph, David, and Solomon. [See *infra*, p. 907.]

SANDMEL (626c) disagrees with DAUBE (626d), who had argued that Josephus' rewriting of the Bible was influenced by Hellenistic rhetorical devices. He rejects the thesis of HENGEL (626e) that Judaism was pervaded by Hellenism long before Antiochus Epiphanes and notes that the Book of Chronicles already contains certain aspects of what HENGEL calls Hellenistic thought.

## 10.2: Josephus' Biblical Text in General

(626f) JONATHAN P. SIEGEL: *The Severus Scroll and I Q Is<sup>a</sup>* (Masoretic Studies, 2). Missoula, Montana 1975.

(626g) DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY: *Les problèmes textuelles de 2 Samuel*. In his: *Études d'histoire du texte de l'Ancient Testament*. Fribourg 1978.

SIEGEL (626f), pp. 52–53, notes Josephus' report (War 7. 150 and 7. 162) that among the spoils that Titus removed from Jerusalem in 70 was a copy of the Jewish Law. In Life 418 Josephus reports that Titus gave Josephus a gift of sacred books. There is no way of knowing, says SIEGEL, whether the Severus Scroll of the Torah was among those sacred texts, but he inclines to this view, since it is more likely that a Hebrew scroll in Rome would survive under private than under public auspices.

BARTHÉLEMY (626g) contends that Josephus' Biblical text had been imported from Babylonia, noting that Josephus (Ant. 17. 24–27) attests to intensified contact between Palestine and Babylonia during Herod's reign.



## 10.3: Josephus' Use of the Septuagint and of Targumim for the Hexateuch

- (627) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, ed., Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (628) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (629) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, trans.: Flavius Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Jerusalem 1944.
- (630) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews'. In: Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 4, 1965, pp. 163–188.
- (631) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus. In: KARL H. RENGSTORF, ed., A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus, Supplement 1. Leiden 1968.
- (632) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: Biblical Names and Their Meanings in Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, Books I and II, 1–200. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism 2, 1971, pp. 167–182.
- (633) FRANZ BLATT, ed.: The Latin Josephus, I: Introduction and Text, The Antiquities, Books I–V. (Acta Jutlandica 30.1, Hum. Ser. 44). Aarhus and Copenhagen 1958.
- (634) GEORGE E. HOWARD: The Letter of Aristee and Diaspora Judaism. In: Journal of Theological Studies 22, 1971, pp. 337–348.
- (635) SALOMO RAPPAPORT: Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus. Wien 1930.
- (636) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 5, Jewish Antiquities, Books V–VIII (Loeb Classical Library). London 1934.
- (637) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: Il testo della Bibbia in Flavio Giuseppe. In: Atti del XIX Congresso internazionale degli Orientalisti, Roma, 23–29 sett. 1935 (Rome 1938), pp. 464–470.
- (638) ROGER LE DÉAUT: Introduction à la littérature targumique, Part 1. Rome 1966.
- (639) MARTIN MCNAMARA: The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch. Rome 1966.
- (640) JOHN BOWKER: The Targums and Rabbinic Literature: An Introduction to Jewish Interpretations of Scripture. Cambridge 1969.
- (641) NAOMI G. COHEN: Jewish Names and Their Significance in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods in Asia Minor. Diss., Ph. D., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1969 (in Hebrew). 2 vols.
- (642) AZARIAH DEI ROSSI: Me'or 'Enayim. Mantua 1573–75.
- (643) LEONHARD H. BROCKINGTON: Septuagint and Targum. In: Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 66, 1954, pp. 80–86.
- (643a) PETER WALTERS (KATZ): The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendations, ed. by DAVID W. GOODING. (Originally diss., Cambridge 1945). London 1973.
- (643b) RENÉE BLOCH: Note méthodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique. In: Recherches de Science religieuse 43, 1955, pp. 194–227. Trans. into English by WILLIAM S. GREEN and WILLIAM J. SULLIVAN: Methodological Note for the Study of Rabbinic Literature. In: WILLIAM S. GREEN, ed., Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice (Brown Judaica Studies, 1). Missoula, Montana 1978. Pp. 51–75.
- (643c) KARL HOHEISEL: Das antike Judentum in christlicher Sicht. Ein Beitrag zur neueren Forschungsgeschichte (Studies in Oriental Religion, 2). Wiesbaden 1978.

While there is evidence for Josephus' use of a Greek text of the Bible for the historical books, the evidence for his use of the Septuagint, in any of the forms known to us, for the Hexateuch is slight. HÖLSCHER (627) notes a number of coincidences between 'Antiquities', Book 1, and the Septuagint; but,

as COHEN (628) remarks, their paucity and general insignificance are striking. SCHALIT (629), pp. xxviii ff., similarly cites a number of verbal coincidences in his attempt to prove Josephus' dependence upon the Septuagint, but some of these are not valid, and the total that remains is slight indeed. SCHALIT (630) asserts that he is convinced by his work on the proper names in Josephus' writings that it is far more probable that Josephus used the Greek Bible than that he employed the Hebrew original, though he admits that Josephus' use of the Hebrew Bible needs further consideration. In his concordance of the proper names in Josephus (631) he concludes, at one point (p. 75), that Josephus always, or almost always, had before him the Greek Bible, though it was one which differs often from our Septuagint. At another point (p. 108) he more dogmatically states that Josephus used only the Greek Bible. But, we may suggest, a Greek form in proper names may reflect the fact that he is writing in the Greek language and that he or his literary assistants Hellenized the form of the Hebrew proper names, or, alternatively, that this Hellenization was the work of those who copied the Greek manuscripts of Josephus at a later period.

SHUTT (632) concludes that Josephus used both the Hebrew text and the Septuagint for his version of Genesis, but that he preferred the Septuagint and that he is sometimes independent of both. He fails, however, to consider that his Septuagint may have been different from that of any of our over 2000 manuscripts, and that the Dead Sea Scrolls indeed show that the gap between the Septuagint and the Hebrew text in sectarian circles was not as great as had been previously thought. SHUTT, moreover, inexplicably makes no attempt to consider systematically the various manuscripts of the Septuagint or the various manuscripts of the Latin translation as noted in BLATT's (633) edition or the spelling of the names in Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' or in the Targumim to determine Josephus' relationship to them. In a number of cases, we may remark, Josephus, as shown by his agreement with Pseudo-Philo, is following a Jewish tradition, even if it is not in our Septuagint or in the Hebrew Masoretic text.

One possibility to explain Josephus' verbal departures from the Biblical text is to postulate that his Hebrew text was itself different from ours. The discovery of Biblical texts, few to be sure for the Hexateuch, among the Dead Sea Scrolls confirms that various readings were to be found. Indeed, the Letter of Aristeeas 30, in a much debated passage, seems to refer, as HOWARD (634) notes, to corrupt Hebrew manuscripts of the Pentateuch written in Hebrew characters or in the Hebrew language but haphazardly and without meaning and hence in need of correction.

RAPPAPORT (635), MARCUS (636), p. viii, and SCHALIT (629), pp. xxvii–xxxv, suggest that Josephus is dependent upon an Aramaic Targumic paraphrase of the Bible, though the examples that SCHALIT cites are hardly convincing.

RICCIOTTI (637) properly concludes that Josephus is of no special value for determining the Hebrew Biblical text since he was an eclectic who used the Septuagint and an Aramaic version much more than the Hebrew. We know that there were many paraphrases in Aramaic, and it may be, though it is impossible to prove, that Josephus is dependent upon one of those now lost. Moreover,

there is no doubt that Aramaic was the mother tongue of Josephus, and that it was in Aramaic that he composed the original version of the 'War'.

LE DÉAUT (638), pp. 56–58, 160–161, accepts as a certainty the view that Josephus used some sort of Aramaic Targum for his paraphrase of the Bible (there is no basis, however, for his view that the Targum is practically identical with the traditional Targum of Jonathan) and consequently stresses the importance of the study of Josephus for the study of Targumic traditions.

McNAMARA (639), pp. 23–24, gives a brief bibliographical survey of Josephus' relations to Targumim and midrashim.

BOWKER (640), who discusses the evolution of Jewish Biblical exegesis, gives, pp. 31–32, a brief summary of and bibliography on Josephus' value as a source for the Palestinian Targum tradition.

COHEN (641) has noted a parallel between the Syriac Peshitta (which is close to Aramaic) and Josephus in the spelling of the name of Reuben as Rubel; such coincidences are not due to the fact that Josephus spoke Aramaic, because, if this were so, why are they relatively rare?

Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2. 38, in a passage neglected by scholars, says, we may note, that the Greek of the Septuagint corresponds literally with the Chaldaean. Chaldaean normally refers to Aramaic rather than to Hebrew, and hence this may indicate a belief that the translation was made from an Aramaic Targum.

In the sixteenth century the remarkable Italian rabbi AZARIAH DEI ROSSI (642), being cognizant of this passage, had suggested that the changes in the Septuagint as against the Hebrew Masoretic text were due to the fact that it was a translation of a popular Aramaic Targum such as was used by Ezra and which, because it was not carefully guarded, had a number of variants which were later incorporated into the Septuagint. There is no indication that Josephus, however, in his long account of how the Septuagint was composed, had any suspicion that it was based upon an Aramaic text. But even if the translation was made from the Hebrew, it seems reasonable to assume, as does BROCKINGTON (643), that the translators incorporated into their work interpretations, presumably oral, from which the authors of the Targumim also drew. Even verbal indebtedness to Aramaic may be seen, as BROCKINGTON notes, in the Septuagint's use in Exodus 12.19 of γειώρᾱς, clearly drawn from the Aramaic *giora* rather than from the Hebrew *ger*.

Of course there were many translations into Aramaic, since it was apparently customary at a religious service, where the reading of the Pentateuch was the central feature, for the Hebrew original to be paraphrased in Aramaic (Megillah 3a, Soferim 1.8, Exodus Rabbah 5), the language of the masses. Josephus heard such translations each week and could not help but be influenced by them.

WALTERS (643a), in seeking to establish the text of the Septuagint, cites Josephus (see index, p. 415) on numerous lexical and grammatical matters.

BLOCH (643b) suggests that Josephus' aggadic source was an Aramaic translation of the Bible; but, we may comment, this will hardly account for such vast expansions of the Biblical material as we find in Josephus' account of Moses' campaign in Ethiopia.

HOHEISEL (643c) agrees with RAPPAPORT (635) that Josephus used an Aramaic Targum for the 'Antiquities'.

#### 10.4: The Canon of the Bible

- (644) HERBERT E. RYLE: *The Canon of the Old Testament: An Essay on the Gradual Growth and Formation of the Hebrew Canon of Scripture*. London 1892.
- (645) WILLIAM ROBERTSON SMITH: *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*. New York 1881; 2nd ed., London 1892.
- (646) BROOKE F. WESTCOTT: *The Bible in the Church: A Popular Account of the Collection and Reception of the Holy Scriptures in the Christian Churches*. London 1864.
- (647) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *An Historical Study of the Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*. In: *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 3, 1931–32, pp. 121–158.
- (648) MOSES H. SEGAL: *The Promulgation of the Authoritative Text of the Hebrew Bible*. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72, 1953, pp. 35–47.
- (649) MOSHE GREENBERG: *The Stabilization of the Text of the Hebrew Bible Reviewed in the Light of the Biblical Materials from the Judean Desert*. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 76, 1956, pp. 157–167.
- (650) OTTO EISSFELDT: *Einleitung in das Alte Testament, unter Einschluss der Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen sowie der apokryphen- und pseudepigraphenartigen Qumran-Schriften: Entstehungsgeschichte des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen 1934; 2nd ed., 1956; 3rd ed., 1964. Trans. into English by PETER R. ACKROYD: *The Old Testament; an introduction, including the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, and also the works of similar type from Qumran; the history of the formation of the Old Testament*. New York 1965.
- (651) PETER KATZ: *The Old Testament Canon in Palestine and Alexandria*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 47, 1956, pp. 191–217.
- (652) ROBERT LAIRD HARRIS: *Inspiration and Canonicity of the Bible: an Historical and Exegetical Study*. Grand Rapids 1957.
- (653) ASHER FINKEL: *The Pharisees and the Teacher of Nazareth; a Study of Their Background*. Leiden 1964.
- (654) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (655) ALBERT C. SUNDBERG: *The Old Testament of the Early Church* (Harvard Theological Studies, 20). Cambridge, Mass. 1964.
- (656) BERTIL ALBREKTSON: *Josefus, Rabbi Akiba och Qumran. Tre argument i discussionen om tidpunkten för den gemmaltestamentliga konsonanttextens standardisering (= Josephus, Rabbi Akiba and Qumran: Three Arguments in the Discussion of the Date of the Standardization of the Consonantal Text of the Old Testament)*. In: *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* (Helsinki) 73, 1968, pp. 201–215.
- (657) JÜRGEN C. H. LEBRAM: *Aspekte der alttestamentlichen Kanonbildung*. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 18, 1968, pp. 173–189.
- (658) GEORGE W. ANDERSON: *Canonical and Non-Canonical*. In: PETER R. ACKROYD and CHRISTOPHER F. EVANS, edd., *The Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. 1: *From the Beginnings to Jerome*. Cambridge 1970. Pp. 113–159.
- (659) SID Z. LEIMAN: *The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence for the Canonization of Hebrew Scripture*. Diss., Ph. D., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1970.
- (660) LINO DE BENETTI: *E' esistito il Canone Alessandrino?* In: *Rivista di Cultura biblica e teologica* 7, 1972, pp. 29–47.

- (661) RUDOLF MEYER: Bemerkungen zum literargeschichtlichen Hintergrund der Kanontheorie des Josephus. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 285–299.
- (661a) JOHANNES LEIPOLDT and SIEGFRIED MORENZ: *Heilige Schriften; Betrachtungen zur Religionsgeschichte der antiken Mittelmeerwelt*. Leipzig 1953.
- (661b) ROBERT HANHART: *Drei Studien zum Judentum*. Munich 1967.
- (661c) JACK FINEGAN: *Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus*. Philadelphia and Boston 1969.
- (661d) JONATHAN P. SIEGEL: *The Severus Scroll and I Q Is<sup>a</sup> (Masoretic Studies, 2)*. Missoula, Montana 1975.
- (661e) SID Z. LEIMAN: *The Canonization of Hebrew Scripture: The Talmudic and Midrashic Evidence*. In: *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 47, February 1976, pp. 1–234.
- (661f) JAY BRAVERMAN: *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 7)*. Washington 1978.

The notice in Josephus (Against Apion 1. 37–40) concerning the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures has justly been recognized to be of major importance because it is the earliest statement of the number and classification of the books of the Bible.

Josephus says (Against Apion 1. 42) that although long ages have passed, no one has ventured to add to or subtract from the Scriptures even a syllable. RYLE (644), pp. 158–166, finds it impossible to reconcile this statement with the view of many scholars that such books as the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes were not canonized until later, perhaps, some say, even after Josephus wrote.

SMITH (645), pp. 149–152 (163–166 in the second edition), argues that Josephus' statement about the antiquity of the canon is inconsistent with the fact that we find no complete formal catalogue of Scripture in earlier writers such as Ben Sira, and that there is a discrepancy between the number and identity of books in the Septuagint and the number of books, twenty-two, given by Josephus (Against Apion 1. 40), and that this shows that the canon was only gradually formed. We may reply that in this statement (Against Apion 1. 42) about the antiquity and unchangeability of Scripture, as we have noted elsewhere, Josephus is using a commonplace of historiography (e.g. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Thucydides 5 and 8; Lucian, *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit* 47) and, even more important, is repeating Deuteronomy 4. 2, which clearly refers to the prohibition against modifying the Five Books of Moses and not all the Scriptures. That, furthermore, Ben Sira does not have a formal catalogue is due to the nature of Ben Sira, which is a wisdom book and not a history or a work of theology. If, we may add, the Septuagint has a different canon from that in Josephus, this may indicate, as the Talmud notes, that there were indeed disagreements about certain books, notably Proverbs (*Eduyyoth* 5. 3), Song of Songs (*Yadaim* 3. 5), Ecclesiastes (*Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan* 1. 2), and Esther (*Megillah* 7a). Finally, the fact that Josephus mentions twenty-two books, whereas the rabbinic tradition (*Ta'anith* 5a, *Baba Bathra* 14b) specifies twenty-four, may mean only that Josephus attached Ruth to Judges and Lamentations to Jeremiah, as was done also in the Church tradition.

WESTCOTT (646), pp. 25–30, states that Josephus' testimony concerning the canon is not the expression of a private opinion but represents an official position. This is indeed likely, we may comment, in view of the apologetic nature of 'Against Apion' and the important position that this discussion occupies in Josephus' general argument.

ZEITLIN (647) says that the difference between Josephus' twenty-two books and the Talmud's twenty-four books may be explained by postulating that the latter reflects the final canonization and that Ecclesiastes and Esther were added after Josephus wrote his work; but, we may comment, the Septuagint, in all the versions that we have, has both of these books, and the Biblical Antiquities 39. 3 ascribed to Philo, the original of which most scholars date contemporaneously with Josephus, has a distinct echo of Esther 4. 14. Finally, the fact that Josephus (Against Apion 1. 40) here mentions that the prophetic books of the Bible cover the period from the death of Moses until Artaxerxes the successor of Xerxes, whom Josephus (Ant. 11. 184) identifies with the Ahasuerus of the Book of Esther, shows that Josephus regarded the Book of Esther as part of the canon.

SEGAL (648) and GREENBERG (649) say that Josephus' statement (Against Apion 1. 42) that no one in long ages has ventured to alter a single syllable in the Scriptures proves that the Hebrew text had been consecrated by the veneration of generations and was regarded as fixed unalterably. But, as noted above, according to the Letter of Aristeas (308–311), a curse was pronounced upon anyone who should alter the text in the slightest, and yet numerous changes were made; hence such a formula need not be taken seriously. Moreover, as we have noted, the formula itself is apparently a commonplace. Finally, as we have seen, Josephus himself (Ant. 1. 17) says that he will not add to or subtract from the Biblical text and then proceeds to do just that. It is contradictory, we may add, for SEGAL to say, on the one hand, that Josephus' statement proves that the Hebrew text had been consecrated for long ages and then to say that a new text of the Torah was not promulgated until the days of Judah the Maccabee.

EISSFELDT (650), pp. 768–770 (2nd ed.), contends that Josephus' reference in Against Apion 1. 38–42 proves that the canon was closed by 100.

KATZ (651) notes that Josephus differs from the Septuagint in separating the Book of Job from his last group as a former prophet and by having the prophets proper immediately after the former prophets, so that the hymnical and didactic books are after the prophetic books as in the Hebrew Bible. In this, he says, Josephus follows the pre-rabbinic order, which resembles the final Greek and Hebrew arrangements and certainly is one of the various orders current in contemporary Palestine. We may comment, however, that inasmuch as Josephus merely gives the number of books in each of the three parts of the Bible, it is difficult to be sure about the status of particular books.

HARRIS (652), pp. 141–142, argues that Josephus is of more value than the Talmud with regard to the canon because he wrote unaffected by the decisions of Jamnia about 90 C.E. and because, according to Josephus (Life 418), Titus gave him a gift of sacred books and Josephus would thus be in an excellent position to know the official views of the Temple concerning the order of the books. We may comment that there is no evidence that any decisions were made

at Jamnia regarding the canon. As to the sacred books that he received from Titus, Josephus does not specify which books they were, nor does he say that they included all the books of the Bible; the fact that he says βιβλίων ἱερῶν rather than τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων would indicate that they did not include all the books of the Bible. We may add that the Temple had nothing to do with the order of the books: it dealt with the sacrifices, while the rabbis decided such matters as the canon.

FINKEL (653), pp. 23–25, says that Josephus gives us evidence for a *terminus ante quem* for the canon, and that he is supported by the fact that the books of the Bible were copied and commented on even among the sectaries of Qumran. We may remark that no one disputes that certain books of the Bible were indeed regarded as authoritative and much before Josephus. The question is with regard to particular books. As to Qumran, aside from the problem of date of the scrolls which is still much disputed, the fact that even in books such as Samuel and Isaiah, which are universally agreed to have been regarded as canonical long before Josephus, there are differences in the text shows that the text was still disputed.

THACKERAY (654), p. 79, says that the fact that Origen and Jerome, who were in close touch with and indeed derived much of their information from Palestinian rabbinic tradition, state, as does Josephus (Against Apion 1. 40), that the number of books in the Bible is twenty-two, shows that they saw no discrepancy between this figure and that of the rabbis, twenty-four, which they reduced to twenty-two by combining Ruth with Judges and Lamentations with Jeremiah. SUNDBERG (655), pp. 69–72, objects that while Origen and Jerome have the same number of books, Josephus' order remains peculiar to him; but we may comment that there is no discussion in Josephus of the order of the books. As to the Talmud (Baba Bathra 14b), the fact that it puts Isaiah before Ezekiel, whereas the earliest extant manuscripts of the Hebrew Bible, as well as the earliest printed editions, put it before Jeremiah and Ezekiel, indicates that there was an alternate tradition with regard to the order of the books.

ALBREKTSON (656), pp. 203–207, arguing against SEGAL's (648) and GREENBERG's (649) conclusion that the Biblical text had long before been fixed because Josephus (Against Apion 1. 42) says so, stresses that when Josephus says that it is prohibited to add to or to subtract from the Bible, he is thinking of the content rather than of the consonants of the text. But, we may reply, the fact that the Letter of Aristeeas (308–311) employs language similar to that of Josephus and clearly refers to the prohibition against verbal changes shows that this is most likely the meaning here. Moreover, the rabbis clearly understood it to apply to the text as well as to the content, since they, especially Josephus' contemporary Rabbi Akiva, insist that every letter goes back to Sinai, and that even apparent 'errors' of spelling have significance. That the letters indeed have significance and may not be modified is clear also from Jesus' comment (Matthew 5. 18): "Not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished."

LEBRAM (657) concludes that for Josephus the canon is an indication of the time during which the prophetic spirit was alive. In this, we may comment, Josephus, who remarks (Against Apion 1. 40) that the period of the prophets

continued down to the time of Artaxerxes, who became king of Persia in 465, agrees with the rabbinic tradition, which posited that prophecy continued until Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi (Yoma 9b), who are clearly post-Exilic and probably date from the time of Ezra in the mid-fifth century.

ANDERSON (658), pp. 114–117, 124–125, 136–137, 146–148, says that Josephus' utterance regarding the unalterability of the canon is to be explained in part by his apologetic purpose in the 'Against Apion'; but, as we have seen, Josephus makes a similar statement about the unalterability of Scripture in the prooemium to his 'Antiquities' (1. 17). ANDERSON notes that the number of books which Josephus cites, twenty-two, represents the Palestinian canon, since Josephus shows elsewhere that he was aware of the Septuagint, which has a different canon; but there is no indication, we may reply, so far as we may judge from Philo in particular, that the canon of the Septuagint at the time of Josephus included such books.

LEIMAN (659) concludes that Josephus, the Apocrypha, the Talmud, and the Qumran discoveries support the view that the canon was closed in most Jewish circles by the early Maccabean period rather than in 90 C.E., as most handbooks state. The error into which previous scholars have fallen is due, he says, to their failure to distinguish the idea of canonicity from that of inspiration, since not all canonical books were inspired.

DE BENETTI (660) is rightly not convinced either from Josephus or the Septuagint or the New Testament or synagogue usage that there is any cogent evidence that the canon in Alexandria was different from that in Palestine.

MEYER (661), commenting on *Against Apion* 1. 38–41 in the light of the finds at Qumran, says that Qumran shows that the canon was still fluid at that time. We may, however, object that the Qumran community was sectarian and may have had a different canon.

LEIPOLDT and MORENZ (661a), pp. 41–42, commenting on the canon of the Jewish scriptures in Josephus (*Against Apion* 1. 37–40), connects Josephus' statement that there are twenty-two books in the Bible with the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet.

HANHART (661b), p. 24, concludes that Josephus (*Against Apion* 1. 41) is not decisive as to the date of the closing of the canon.

FINEGAN (661c), pp. 7–8, comments on the identity of the twenty-two books of the Biblical canon mentioned by Josephus (*Against Apion* 1. 38).

SIEGEL (661d), pp. 72–73, commenting on the canon according to *Apion* 1. 37–42, says that Josephus was giving expression to an ideal view, since textual variants existed even in the Temple texts, as we know from the Talmud (*Soferim* 6. 4).

LEIMAN (661e), p. 31–34, declares that Josephus' twenty-two books probably correspond to the twenty-four of the canon as found in the Talmud, with Judges-Ruth and Jeremiah-Lamentations counted as one book each. Josephus implies that the canon had been closed for a very long time. He is the second witness to a closed canon in the first century, since *IV Esdras* 14. 44 contains evidence that a fixed canon was already known in the first century, if not earlier.



BRAVERMAN (661f), pp. 36–37, notes that Jerome, in his Preface to the Books of Samuel and Kings, supports Josephus' tripartite division of the Bible into the Torah, Prophets, and Hagiographa, as well as the view that Josephus' twenty-two books were arrived at by combining Ruth and Lamentations with Judges and Jeremiah respectively.

### 10.5: Josephus' Version of Genesis for the pre-Abrahamic Period

- (661g) THOMAS W. FRANKMAN: *The Literary and Exegetical Treatment of Genesis in the Jewish Antiquities of Flavius Josephus in the Light of Pseudepigrapha, Targumim, and Midrashic Sources*. Diss., Oxford 1975. Publ. as: *Genesis and the 'Jewish Antiquities' of Flavius Josephus* (Biblica et Orientalia, 35). Rome 1979.
- (662) GÉZA VERMÉS: *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. Leiden 1961.
- (663) WILHELM DITTMANN: *Die Auslegung der Urgeschichte (Genesis 1–3) im Neuen Testament*. Göttingen 1953 (microfilm).
- (664) URSULA FRÜCHTEL: *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Genesisexegese*. Leiden 1968.
- (665) JACOB JERVELL: *Imagines und Imago Dei: Aus der Genesis-Exegese des Josephus*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 197–204.
- (666) HANS-GÜNTER LEDER: *Die Auslegung der zentralen theologischen Aussagen der Paradieseserzählung (Gen. 2, 4b–3, 24) in der ältesten Literatur des Judentums und in der Alten Kirche. Teil 1: Die Paradieseserzählungen im Alten Testament, im Judentum und im Neuen Testament*. Diss. (typewritten), Greifswald 1960.
- (667) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Hellenizations in Josephus' Portrayal of Man's Decline*. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (Studies in the History of Religions, 14) Leiden 1968. Pp. 336–353.
- (668) LOUIS GINZBERG: *Flood of Fire* (in Hebrew). In: *Hagoren* 8, 1911–12, p. 35–51.
- (669) OLOF LINTON: *Synopsis Historiae Universalis; om en middelalderig skoletraditions forudsætninger: bibelsk-jødisk, graesk-hellenistik og oldkirkelig tradition*. (Festschrift udgivet af Københavns Universitet i anledning af Universitetets Årsfest November 1957. Copenhagen 1957. Pp. 1–144.
- (670) ROBERT H. PFEIFFER: *Aeva Mundi*. In: *Ricerche di Storia Religiosa* 1, 1957, pp. 245–253.
- (671) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans., *Josephus*, vol. 4, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books I–IV (Loeb Classical Library). London 1930.
- (672) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Prolegomenon*. In reissue of: MONTAGUE R. JAMES, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. New York 1971. Pp. vii–clxix.
- (673) JACQUES MEYSING: *La Chronographie juive à l'époque gréco-romain*. In: *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 41, 1967, pp. 289–304.
- (674) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: *Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 61, 1968, pp. 451–481.
- (675) JACK P. LEWIS: *A Study of the Interpretation of Noah and the Flood in Jewish and Christian Literature*. Leiden 1968.
- (675a) JOSEPH A. FITZMYER and DANIEL J. HARRINGTON: *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (Second Century B.C.–Second Century A.D.)* (Biblica et Orientalia, 34). Rome 1978.
- (676) PHILIP S. ALEXANDER: *The Toponymy of the Targumim, with special reference to the Table of Nations and the Boundaries of the Land of Israel*. Diss., D. Phil., Oxford University, 1974.

- (676a) J. B. SCHALLER: Gen. 1. 2 im antiken Judentum (Untersuchungen über Verwendung und Deutung der Schöpfungsaussagen von Gen. 1. 2 im antiken Judentum). Diss., Göttingen 1961.
- (676b) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Drei Erdkarten. Ein Beitrag zur Erdkenntnis des hebräischen Altertums (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jhrg. 1944/8, 3. Abhandlung). Heidelberg 1949.
- (676c) THOMAS FRANCIS GLASSON: Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology. With Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs. London 1961.
- (676d) WOLFGANG SPEYER: Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike. Mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit (Hypomnemata; Untersuchungen zur Antike und ihrem Nachleben, Heft 24). Göttingen 1970.
- (676e) G. J. REININK: Das Land 'Seiris' (Šir) und das Volk der Serer in jüdischen und christlichen Traditionen. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism 6, 1975, pp. 72–85.
- (676f) ALBERTUS F. J. KLIJN: Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 46). Leiden 1977.
- (676g) FERDINAND DEXINGER: Stura der Göttersöhne oder Engel vor der Sintflut? In: Wiener Beiträge zur Theologie 13, 1966, p. 96.
- (676h) ROBERT A. KRAFT: Philo (Josephus, Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon) on Enoch. In: P. J. ACHTEMEIER, ed., Society of Biblical Literature 1978 Seminar Papers, vol. 1. Missoula, Montana 1978. Pp. 253–257.
- (676i) MARSHALL D. JOHNSON: The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus (Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, vol. 8). Cambridge 1969.
- (676j) ARNO BORST: Der Turmbau von Babel; Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker. 4 vols. Stuttgart 1957–63.
- (676k) VASSILIOS CHRISTIDÈS: L'énigme d'Ophir. In: Revue Biblique 77, 1970, pp. 240–247.

I have not seen FRANXMAN's (661g) dissertation, which attempts to place Josephus more precisely in the chronological evolution of midrash, as VERMÈS (662), his preceptor, has done in his highly suggestive but preliminary survey. In his summary FRANXMAN indicates that for Genesis Josephus expands considerably in ten pericopes – Antiquities 1. 67–88, 109–121, 122–147, 148–160, 161–168, 222–236, 285–308; 2. 9–38, 39–59, and 124–159. On the other hand, he considerably abridges twelve pericopes – Antiquities 1. 27–33, 169–185, 186–193, 194–206, 207–212, 237–256, 257–266, 309–324, 325–336, 337–346; 2. 1–8, and 189–200. Twelve other pericopes correspond to the Biblical text – Antiquities 1. 34–40, 41–51, 51–66, 89–108, 213–221, 267–284; 2. 60–74, 75–94, 95–113, 114–123, 160–167, and 168–188. His conclusion is that in reworking the Bible Josephus is following the text faithfully, and that his changes may represent exegetical traditions that are much better thought out than has hitherto been suspected. If so, we may ask how we are to explain the unevenness in the treatment of the various pericopes. [See *infra* p. 908.]

DITTMANN (663), pp. 38–48, in his summary of Josephus' treatment of Genesis, chapters 1–3, asserts that Josephus was strongly influenced in what he says and omits by his own personality. He concludes that Josephus is an historian rather than a theological exegete or a philosopher in his conception of G-d and man in his paraphrase of these chapters, and that he is interested in Adam and Eva as historical personages rather than as props in a theological system. That Josephus approaches the Bible as history rather than as theology,

we may add, is clear also from a number of references in the 'Antiquities' that he intends to discuss elsewhere such theological matters as the reason for the practice of circumcision (Ant. 1. 192), the major portion of the laws (Ant. 3. 94), the reason for the shewbread (Ant. 3. 143), etc. While it is undoubtedly true, however, that Josephus does use independent judgment in his paraphrase, it is incumbent upon DITTMANN to make a more thorough investigation than he has done of the rabbinic parallels and, above all, of Josephus' motives for including some traditions, and omitting and modifying others.

FRÜCHTEL (664), pp. 98–100, makes the pregnant suggestion, which is worth further investigation, that Josephus in his account of creation used the exegesis practiced by Alexandrian scholars in their interpretations of Homer and of Plato.

JERVELL (665), commenting on Josephus' description of the creation of man (Genesis 1. 26–31; Ant. 1. 32), notes that Josephus represses both here and elsewhere the Biblical statement that man was created in the image of G-d. He rightly contends that this omission is not due to Josephus' having a different Biblical text but rather to his strong view that G-d Himself is not describable and to his strictness about images.

LEDER (666), pp. 545–564, has a brief summary of Josephus' version of the Paradise narrative.

I (667) have suggested that Josephus followed well-known Greek traditions and has many verbal reminiscences in his developed picture of the original Golden Age of mankind, as well as in his account of the decline of civilization that followed the sin of Adam and Eve, and that his account is often directed theologically to answering the objections of those who had pointed out difficulties in the Biblical text. On Josephus' addition (Ant. 1. 70) to the Biblical text reporting Adam's prediction of a destruction of the universe by fire and water, we may add a parallel in Pseudo-Philo's Biblical Antiquities 3. 9; and to the literature on the subject add GINZBERG (668), who suggests a Babylonian and Egyptian source for the story.

The relation of Josephus' chronology, particularly for the antediluvian period, to that of our other sources, has been discussed by several scholars. LINTON (669) correctly concludes that Josephus is following a tradition totally different from that of the rabbinic 'Seder Olam Rabbah'. PFEIFFER (670) notes Josephus' similarity to the Septuagint in his chronology of the patriarchs before the Flood but the differences after the Flood. On this see the convenient table in THACKERAY (671), pp. 39 and 73, and in my Prolegomenon (672) to Pseudo-Philo, pp. lxxxiii and lxxxvii. MEYSING (673), pp. 295–299, concludes that Josephus' chronology is fragile, inconsistent, and confused, reflecting, he thinks, the Jewish confusion in his era, and that numerology lies behind this chronology. WACHOLDER (674), p. 453, who admits that Josephus used the Septuagint in the chronology of the antediluvian period, argues that he used the Hebrew for the postdiluvian period, and that NIESE and THACKERAY are wrong in adopting the readings of two of the manuscripts, R and O, rather than the other manuscripts. But, we may note, the individual figures for the Noahides correspond in all the manuscripts with the Septuagint in four cases, with the

Hebrew alone in one case, with both the Septuagint and Hebrew in one case, and with neither in three cases. The fact that for the antediluvian period Pseudo-Philo, a contemporary of Josephus, agrees with the Hebrew twice, with the Septuagint (and Josephus) three times, with both twice, and with neither three times, and that for the postdiluvian period there is no relation between it and either the Hebrew or the Septuagint or Josephus would seem to indicate that there were a number of traditions with regard to chronology, and that Josephus' source remains to be recovered.

LEWIS (675), pp. 77–81, restricts himself almost completely to a mere summary of Josephus and concludes that Josephus' treatment of the flood is a simple paraphrase of the Septuagint, showing only minimal contact with rabbinic materials and only marginal influence of the Greek spirit. My own, still to be published, study indicates that while the changes are not as extensive as elsewhere, Lewis has exaggerated the situation.

FITZMYER and HARRINGTON (675a), p. 205, commenting on the 4Q 'Mes-sianic' Text found at Qumran, which presents a fragment of a prediction of a new-born child, suggest that it may be related to descriptions of the birth of Noah (Ant. 1. 72–108); a more likely suggestion is that the author had the birth of Moses, as the great savior of the Israelites, in mind.

ALEXANDER (676), pp. 53–71, has analyzed Josephus' exposition of the Table of the Nations (Genesis 10 = Antiquities 1. 122–147) with regard to the principles of toponymy which it implies and has correlated it with the Palestinian Targumim with a view to dating the latter works; on pp. 163–168 he examines Josephus' equivalents for the Biblical sons of Japheth.

I have not seen SCHALLER (676a), pp. 95–100, who comments on Josephus' version (Ant. 1. 27ff.) of Genesis 1. 2.

HÖLSCHER (676b), p. 44, concludes that Josephus (Ant. 1. 39) betrays his Alexandrian source in his comments on the Gihon and the Nile Rivers. He also comments (pp. 49, 69, 71, 73) on Josephus' table of the peoples descended from Noah; in particular (pp. 49, 71) he discusses Josephus' equation (and that of Jerahmeel 31. 1) of Magog and the Scythians (Ant. 1. 123) and (pp. 25–26) the equation of Put and the Libyans (Ant. 1. 132–133), as well as (p. 48) the equation of Seba and Meroe in Ethiopia (Ant. 2. 249).

GLASSON (676c), pp. 78–79, notes that Josephus' account (Ant. 1. 70) of water and fire destroying the race of man is paralleled in the Pseudepigraphical 'Life of Adam and Eve', in the Talmud (Zevahim 116a) and in II Peter 3. 10–12.

SPEYER (676d), pp. 114–115, notes the similarity between Josephus (Ant. 1. 70–71) and the Life of Adam and Eve 49–50 and Jubilees 8. 3. He cites a similar tradition in the Babylonian legend of Xisuthros in Berossus and Abydemos, as well as in Philo of Byblos (cf. Eusebius, Praeparatio Evangelica 19. 26, who remarks that Sanchuniathon set up the teaching of Hermes upon a monument in the Temple of Amon).

REININK (676e) notes that in Antiquities 1. 71 Josephus says that the children of Seth sought to preserve their astronomical discoveries by writing them on pillars of brick and stone, adding that the stone pillar exists to this day in the land of Seiris. REININK remarks that the term Seiris is based on the old Chinese

word for silk and that the people of Seiris are the Chinese, who were noted for their manufacture of silk. We may suggest, however, that Seir may refer to Mount Seir, which is mentioned in Deuteronomy 33. 2 and elsewhere as a place where G-d appeared to the Israelites.

KLIJN (676f), pp. 23–25 and 121–124, notes the parallel between Josephus (Ant. 1. 70), which speaks about the possibility of a destruction of the universe and a judgment first by fire and then by water, and the Life of Adam and Eve 49–50, which likewise speaks of a future judgment, though there it is first by water and then by fire. KLIJN concludes that both must have drawn upon a common tradition which was identified with the flood and the last judgment, and he suggests that this source was an Egyptian tradition mentioned by Syncellus about Thoth or Hermes writing on pillars before the flood.

DEXINGER (676g) declines to accept the view that Josephus, in his reference (Ant. 1. 73) to ἄγγελοι θεοῦ, was thinking of the Sethites.

KRAFT (676h), citing Antiquities 1. 85, 4. 326, and 9. 28, concludes that for Josephus Enoch is neither a revealer nor a holy person.

JOHNSON (676i), pp. 30–31, compares Josephus' genealogy of the patriarchs (Ant. 1. 86) with the Hebrew Masoretic Text (Gen. 5. 3–31), the Septuagint, the Samaritan version, the Book of Jubilees, and the 'Assumption of Moses'; and he concludes that Josephus is very probably consciously imitating Berossus.

BORST (676j), vol. 1, pp. 170–174, notes that Josephus' table of nations (Ant. 1. 122–147) does not contain all the contemporary peoples because the Bible has antiquarian, not actual, interest for Josephus; for him, even less than for Philo, it is the book of books. BORST also comments briefly on hellenizations in Josephus' version of this passage and on his relation to Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', the Ezra-Apocalypse, and the Baruch-Apocalypse.

CHRISTIDES (676k) notes that Josephus (Ant. 8. 164) locates Ophir, one of the most enigmatic names in the Table of Peoples (Gen. 10. 29), in India. Josephus (Ant. 1. 147) likewise notes that the people of Yoktan live in India.

## 10.6: Josephus' Portrayal of Abraham, Melchisedek, and Isaac

- (677) OTTO SCHMITZ: Abraham im Spätjudentum und im Urchristentum. In: Aus Schrift und Geschichte. Theologische Abhandlungen Adolf Schlatter zu seinem 70. Geburtstage dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern. Stuttgart 1922. Pp. 99–123.
- (678) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Abraham's Knowledge of the Existence of G-d. In: Harvard Theological Review 44, 1951, pp. 137–139.
- (679) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature, Part 2. In: Hebrew Union College Annual 26, 1955, pp. 151–332.
- (680) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Philo's Place in Judaism. Cincinnati 1956.
- (681) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Josephus. In: Transactions of the American Philological Association 99, 1968, pp. 143–156.
- (682) JAMES R. LORD: Abraham: A Study in Ancient Jewish and Christian Interpretation. Diss., Ph. D., Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 1968.
- (683) GÜNTER MAYER: Aspekte des Abrahamsbildes in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur. In: Evangelische Theologie 32, 1972, pp. 118–127.

- (684) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 34, 1963, pp. 83–113.
- (685) DANIEL J. HARRINGTON: Abraham Traditions in the Testament of Abraham and in the 'Rewritten Bible' of the Intertestamental Period. In: ROBERT A. KRAFT, ed., 1972 *Proceedings: International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, no. 2, 1972, pp. 155–164.
- (686) LOUIS GINZBERG: *The Legends of the Jews*. Vol. 5. Philadelphia 1925.
- (687) GÉZA VERMÈS: *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. Leiden 1961.
- (688) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: How Long Did Abram Stay in Egypt?: A Study in Hellenistic, Qumran, and Rabbinic Chronography. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 35, 1964, pp. 43–56. Rpt. in his: *Essays on Jewish Chronology and Chronography*. New York 1976. Pp. 45–58.
- (689) HELGA RUSCHE: Die Gestalt des Melchisedek. In: *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 6, 1955, pp. 230–252.
- (690) M. PETER: Melchizedek w egzegezie judaistycznej (= Melchizedek in Jewish Exegesis). In: *Analecta Cracoviana* 3, 1971, pp. 171–181.
- (691) DAVID LERSCH: Isaaks Opferung christlich gedeutet. Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. Tübingen 1950.
- (691a) HANS-J. SCHOEPS: *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Tübingen 1950.
- (691b) MATTHIAS DELCOR: Melchizedek from Genesis to the Qumran Texts and the Epistle to the Hebrews. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 2, 1971, pp. 115–135.
- (691c) FRED L. HORTON: The Melchizedek Tradition. A Critical Examination of the Sources to the Fifth Century A.D. and in the Epistle to the Hebrews (*Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*, Monograph series, 30). Cambridge 1976.
- (691d) MATTHIAS DELCOR: La portée chronologique de quelques interprétations du Targoum Néophyti contenues dans le cycle d'Abraham. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 1, 1970, pp. 105–119.
- (691e) ROGER LE DÉAUT: *La Nuit Pascale. Essai sur la signification de la Pâque juive à partir du Targum d'Exode XII 42*. Rome 1963.
- (691f) ROBERT J. DALY: The Soteriological Significance of the Sacrifice of Isaac. In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39, 1977, pp. 45–75.
- (691g) P. R. DAVIES and B. D. CHILTON: The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History. In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40, 1978, pp. 514–546.

SCHMITZ (677), pp. 110–111, correctly, but all too briefly, notes that Josephus' portrait of Abraham is directed to the taste of his Graeco-Roman readers and that it presents him as a folk-hero and more of a scientist than a prophet.

SANDMEL (678), commenting on *Antiquities* 1.155–156, remarks that Josephus is like the rabbis in having Abraham discover G-d through a process of reasoning; but he does not note that Abraham's proof in Josephus is quite different from that of the rabbis in that it stresses not the order but the aberrations in the movements of the heavenly bodies.

SANDMEL (679), pp. 180–198, and (680), pp. 59–76, argues that Josephus' account lacks any striking, unified, and coherent conception, and that it is little more than a pedestrian recapitulation of the Bible, with a faint Hellenistic color, but devoid of insight and assessment.

I (681) have suggested that, on the contrary, Josephus, for apologetic reasons, does present a coherent portrait of Abraham as a typical national hero such as was popular in Hellenistic times, with emphasis on him as a statesman,

philosopher, logician, rhetorician, scientist, and romantic hero. In particular, Abraham's teleological proof for the existence of G-d (Ant. 1. 156), from the irregularities of the heavenly bodies, though it is in the form of the proofs promulgated by the Greek philosophical schools, is found only in Josephus; it is clear from the context that Josephus is here combatting the Stoics.

LORD (682), pp. 162–169, is a mere summary of the passages in which Josephus adds to the Biblical picture. He concludes, though without citing evidence, that Abraham's characteristics are tailored to the Hellenistic ideal. He correctly notes that Josephus is not interested in Abraham as the father of the Jewish faith, but he does not explain why this is so, namely because Josephus is an apologetic historian rather than a writer on theology, on which, says Josephus (Ant. 1. 25 and elsewhere), he will write a separate work.

MAYER (683) presents a useful survey of the motifs found in the depiction of Abraham in various Hellenistic authors, including Josephus, but strangely ignoring Pseudo-Philo, in his role as the father of nations, the inventor and transmitter of culture, the philosopher, and ideal ruler. Such a portrait, he correctly suggests, may be influenced by Neo-Pythagorean ideals and would be useful to Jews in their propaganda seeking – with extraordinary success, as it turned out – converts among Gentiles.

WACHOLDER (684), comparing the portrait of Abraham the astrologer in Pseudo-Eupolemus, Artapanus, Josephus, and, to some degree, rabbinic literature, concludes that Josephus was not dependent on Pseudo-Eupolemus, who differs from the Hellenistic and rabbinic sources in making astrology the main theme of Abraham's accomplishments. Such a conclusion seems premature in view of the fragmentary nature of Pseudo-Eupolemus.

HARRINGTON (685) notes that the major similarity between Josephus and the Testament of Abraham is to be found in the tradition that the angels only seemed to eat (Ant. 1. 197) and that the food of the angel Michael was eaten by a devouring spirit (Testament of Abraham 4). But, we may remark, this motif is found not only in Philo (De Abrahamo 118) but also frequently in the Talmudic and midrashic literature (see GINZBERG [686], vol. 5, p. 236, n. 143). Again, the motif of Abraham's hospitality found in Josephus (Ant. 1. 200) and the Testament of Abraham (1) is also found in Philo (De Abrahamo 114), as well as often in the Talmudic literature (see GINZBERG [686], vol. 5, p. 235, n. 140).

VERMÈS (687), p. 207, notes Josephus' rational explanations of why Abraham did not say that Sarah was his wife (Ant. 1. 162), as well as of the means by which Sarah was saved, namely, by the outbreak of disease and political disturbance (Ant. 1. 164). He suggests that Josephus' apologetic point of view in his treatment of Abraham and Sarah is similar to that of the Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon; but the latter, we may remark, is too fragmentary for a definitive judgment.

WACHOLDER (688) notes that in the War 4. 530, Josephus says that Hebron was seven years older than Memphis, but that he does not mention that the city was completed when Abram was on his way to Egypt, a detail found in Jubilees and in the 'Genesis Apocryphon' but not in the Talmudic tradition. From this he concludes that Josephus was sometimes influenced by the rabbinic

tradition rather than by the exegesis preserved at Qumran. But the *argumentum ex silentio*, which is always dangerous, is particularly so when applied to Talmudic tradition, since so many of the midrashic traditions are lost.

RUSCHE (689), who examines the figure of Melchisedek (Genesis 14. 18ff.) in Philo, Josephus, rabbinic literature, and the Church Fathers, concludes that Josephus, as Philo and the rabbis, has little to contribute to the theological understanding of the portrayal.

WACHOLDER (684) notes that the business-like relations of Abraham and Melchisedek have no parallel in Pseudo-Eupolemus and hence militate against the theory of Josephus' dependence upon that work.

I have not seen PETER (690), who traces the treatment of Melchizedek in the 'Genesis Apocryphon', the Book of Jubilees, Philo, and Josephus among others.

LERCH (691), pp. 25–27, presents a general treatment of the history of the theme of the sacrifice of Isaac (Genesis 22. 1–19) from Philo and Josephus to modern times; but his treatment of Josephus, pp. 25–27, while noting briefly the differences between Josephus and the Bible, fails to note Josephus' Hellenizations, especially his introduction of Stoic terminology.

SCHOEPS (691a), p. 31, comments on Seth's descendants and (p. 24) on the theme of Abraham as an astrologer (Ant. 1. 167).

DELCOR (691b) comments on the relative little success that the figure of Melchizedek (Ant. 1. 179–181) had in Biblical literature, ascribing this to his Canaanite origins. He notes that even the Hasmonean priests (Ant. 16. 163) avoided calling themselves priests of the order of Melchizedek, referring to themselves merely as "priests of the Most High G-d," alluding doubtlessly, he says, to the G-d of Melchizedek. DELCOR suggests that when Hyrcanus took this title he had ambitions of placing his G-d above all others, and that the Romans accepted this, as seen by the edict of Augustus (Ant. 16. 163). We may comment, however, that the Hasmoneans may have taken this appellation because Zeus was known as "Hypsistos" ("most high"), and that this may be further evidence of their high degree of Hellenization. Hyrcanus would have been ill-advised, indeed, to seek to elevate the Jewish G-d above all others; and we have no evidence that he had any ambitions outside the land of Israel itself, presumably because he was enough of a realist to perceive the limitations of his power.

HORTON (691c) traces the Melchizedek tradition from Genesis through Philo, Josephus, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Rabbinic, Patristic, and Gnostic literature. He notes, pp. 82–83, that the idea that the first temple was built by Melchizedek is dropped in Josephus (Ant. 1. 179–181) and wonders whether this idea may not represent a *ἱερὸς λόγος* about the Temple in Jerusalem; but we may comment that the passage in Josephus is too short to be significant.

DELCOR (691d) concludes that the changes made in the Targum Neofiti and in Josephus (Ant. 1. 186) and in II Baruch on Genesis 12. 6 pertaining to the oak of Mamre are designed to combat superstitious practices. The idea that the three incorporeal visitors of Genesis 18. 8 only appear to eat is in Philo and in



Josephus. There are close correspondences between Neofiti's geography in Genesis 14 and those of the 'Genesis Apocryphon' and Josephus.

LE DÉAUT (691e), p. 22, concludes that Josephus did not dissociate the Biblical text from haggadic embellishments. In particular, pp. 184–188, he summarizes Josephus' account of Abraham and of the sacrifice of Isaac (Ant. 1.222–236), noting haggadic additions.

DALY (691f) surveys the treatment of the sacrifice of Isaac in the Bible (Gen. 22. 1–18), the Targumim, Jubilees, Philo, IV Maccabees, Josephus (Ant. 1.222–236), and Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities'. He lists ten important haggadic elements in Josephus' account, noting that the absence of the concept of faith shows how far Josephus was theologically from the Scriptural account. He concludes that Josephus did not feel very comfortable in relating the incident to his cultured pagan readers, as can be seen from his theological *faux pas* (Ant. 1.233) of having G-d himself apologize for giving the command to Abraham to sacrifice his son. DALY notes Josephus' disagreement with the Targumic idea that Isaac was actually sacrificed and with the Philonic view that the sacrifice was considered as if it had actually been carried out; but he does not explain the reason, namely that Josephus is an apologist who seeks implicitly to contrast the Akedah (the account of the sacrifice of Isaac) with the sacrifice of Iphigenia, which was actually carried out. DALY concludes that the theology of the Akedah had, through these treatments by Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus, become accessible to Christian writers by the beginning of the second century. We may, however, comment that it is not until the third century that extant Church Fathers refer to the Akedah passage in Josephus, that they never refer to the passage in Pseudo-Philo, and that most likely they derived their theology of the Akedah from a direct reading of the Biblical passage itself.

DAVIES and CHILTON (691g) deny that the Akedah doctrine is found in Josephus or, for that matter, in Philo or Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', and hence that it is not an antecedent of New Testament soteriology. They cite two important new elements in Josephus' account, namely that Isaac is informed just before the sacrifice is to be performed and greets the news with joy and rushes to the altar, and secondly that Josephus gives Isaac's age as twenty-five, whereas the Hebrew text says that he was "a lad." By having Isaac co-operate willingly in the sacrifice Josephus avoids the horror that such a story would otherwise have aroused in pagan readers. As to Isaac's age, they note that twenty-five is apparently the minimum age for active service in the war, according to the Dead Sea Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness, and that hence Isaac serves as the prototype of the voluntary martyr. We may, however, suggest that the Adler manuscript of the Midrash Genesis Rabbah 56.8 declares that Isaac was twenty-six at the time of the Akedah, and that according to Jubilees 17.15 he was twenty-three; hence it is not necessary to assume that Josephus' source was the Dead Sea Sect, though admittedly there is a close relationship between the Book of Jubilees and the Sect. As to Isaac's willingness to be sacrificed, this attitude, we may remark, is found throughout rabbinic literature (Genesis Rabbah 56.3–4 and parallels); but, we may note, the unique feature of Josephus' account is that Isaac submitted chiefly because of

filial piety, a point that would certainly appeal to Greek readers. DAVIES and CHILTON, moreover, have missed the most important difference between Josephus and other Jewish sources, namely that Josephus omits the idea that G-d tested both Abraham and Isaac, a notion that is crucial for the understanding of theodicy. We may object, too, that the concept of the sacrifice of Isaac as showing the value of martyrdom, as seen, for example, in IV Maccabees 13. 12, is not to be found in Josephus, despite the claim of DAVIES and CHILTON. They suggest that Isaac is the prototype of those who were active in the war against the Romans; but we may remark that Josephus' opposition to the war was so fundamental that this equation is hard to accept in view of Josephus' obvious admiration for Isaac. In any case, they conclude, Josephus cannot vouch for any pre-Christian Jewish doctrine, since his work is contemporary with or even sometimes posterior to the New Testament, though we may remark that there are so many places where Josephus agrees with Midrashic traditions, which ultimately almost certainly pre-date the New Testament, that this conclusion seems unconvincing.

### 10.7: Joseph

- (692) MARTIN BRAUN: *Griechischer Roman und hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung*. Frankfurt 1934.
- (693) MARTIN BRAUN: *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature*. Oxford 1938.
- (694) HAIM SCHWARZBAUM: *Studies in Jewish and World Folklore*. Berlin 1968.
- (695) HANS SPRÖDOWSKY: *Die Hellenisierung der Geschichte von Joseph in Aegypten bei Flavius Josephus*. Diss., Greifswald 1937 (= *Greifswalder Beiträge zur Literatur- und Stilkforschung*, 18).
- (696) HANS PRIEBATSCH: *Die Josephsgeschichte in der Weltliteratur. Eine legendengeschichtliche Studie*. Breslau 1937.
- (697) T. C. G. THORNTON: *Trees, Gibbets and Crosses*. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 23, 1972, pp. 130–131.
- (697a) A. M. GOLDBERG: *Joseph in der Sicht des Judentums der Antike*. In: *Bibel und Kirche* 21, 1966, pp. 11–15.
- (697b) EDGAR W. SMITH: *Joseph Material in Joseph and Asenath and Josephus Relating to the Testament of Joseph*. In: GEORGE W. E. NICKELSBURG, ed., *Studies on the Testament of Joseph* (*Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, 5). Missoula, Montana 1975. Pp. 133–137.

The only portion of Josephus' retelling of the Bible that has been dealt with thoroughly is the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. BRAUN (692), in a pioneer work, examines the erotic-novelistic motifs introduced by Josephus into his account of Joseph. In a supplementary work BRAUN (693) has an important, if brief (106-page), discussion of the conventional Hellenistic novelistic (especially erotic) elements in Josephus' paraphrase of the Bible in the early books of the 'Antiquities' generally. He compares the treatments of the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife in Genesis, the Testament of Joseph in the Pseudepigrapha, and Josephus, and discusses the indebtedness of the latter two versions to the Phaedra myth as treated by Euripides and to erotic motifs found in the later Greek novels. BRAUN concludes that Josephus Hellenizes Biblical and Haggadic

tales so that they become something completely new and different, whereas the Testament of Joseph Judaizes alien elements.

SCHWARZBAUM (694) rightly objects that such a conclusion is premature until we have a thorough folkloristic comparative study of Josephus' narrative material, which he, one of the giants in the field of folklore, says, is one of the vital tasks of scholarship in this area. My own studies, however, which have now embraced a large portion of Josephus' Biblical paraphrase, tend to confirm strongly the conclusion of BRAUN.

SPRÖDOWSKY (695), in comparing Josephus' account of Joseph with that of the Bible, concludes, but hardly proves, that Josephus has drawn upon an older source, in which SPRÖDOWSKY sees the Alexandrian-Jewish tradition. Neither BRAUN nor SPRÖDOWSKY has, however, made the thorough study of the Hellenistic historians, notably Dionysius of Halicarnassus, so necessary for the understanding of Josephus' viewpoint; and SPRÖDOWSKY has even neglected to consider Josephus' indebtedness to such Graeco-Jewish historians as Demetrius, Pseudo-Hecataeus, Eupolemus, and Artapanus.

PRIEBATSCH (696), pp. 33–35, discusses the relationship of the Joseph narrative in Josephus to his account of the Essenes.

THORNTON (697) cites Antiquities 2. 73, where Joseph predicts that on the third day the baker will be crucified, as well as Antiquities 11. 208 and Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus* 3. 152, which similarly refer to crucifixion, as evidence that Hellenistic Jews interpreted Biblical passages which originally mentioned hanging as referring to crucifixion, a form of execution which was familiar to them from the Roman Empire.

I have not seen GOLDBERG (697a), p. 13, who deals with Josephus' portrait of Joseph.

SMITH (697b) presents a very brief summary of similarities between 'Joseph and Asenath', and the 'Testament of Joseph' in their accounts of Joseph, particularly in their treatment of Asenath, the seductive woman, and concludes that of the two sources thus compared with the 'Testament of Joseph' that of 'Joseph and Asenath' is closer in detail. SMITH, however, is apparently unaware of the works of SPRÖDOWSKY (695) and BRAUN (692) (693) on this very subject, and he has neglected to consider the motifs, particularly the lovesickness of Asenath, as Hellenizations reminiscent of the story of Hippolytus and Phaedra and of Greek novels. Such a study is, in addition, incomplete without reference to the many parallels in midrashim and in the Church Fathers.

## 10.8: Moses and the Exodus

(698) LEOPOLD VON RANKE: *Weltgeschichte*. Vol. 3.2. Leipzig 1883. Pp. 12–33.

(699) MEYER A. HALÉVY: *Moïse dans l'histoire et dans la légende*. Paris 1927. Pp. 82–83, 103–117.

(700) SALOMO RAPPAPORT: *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus*. Wien 1930.

(701) LUDWIG BIELER: *ΘΕΙΟC ΑΝΗΡ*: Das Bild des göttlichen Menschen in Spätantike und Frühchristentum. 2 vols. Vienna 1935–36.

(702) MARTIN BRAUN: *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature*. Oxford 1938.

- (703) GÉZA VERMÈS: La figure de Moïse au tournant des deux Testaments. In: HENRI CAZELLES et al., *Moïse, L'Homme de l'Alliance*. Paris 1955. Pp. 86–92. Trans. into German: Die Gestalt des Moses an der Wende der beiden Testamente. In: FRIDOLIN STIER and ELEONORE BECK, edd., *Moses in Schrift und Überlieferung*. Düsseldorf 1963. Pp. 87–93.
- (704) WAYNE A. MEEKS: The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 14). Leiden 1967.
- (705) DAVID L. TIEDE: The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker (Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series, no. 1) (Originally diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1970). Missoula, Montana 1972.
- (706) CHARLES PERROT: Les récits d'enfance dans la Haggada antérieure au IIe siècle de notre ère. *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 55, 1967, pp. 481–518.
- (707) DANIEL J. SILVER: Moses and the Hungry Birds. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 64, 1973–74, pp. 123–153.
- (708) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 61, 1968, pp. 451–481.
- (709) (HANS) WOLFGANG HELCK: Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den ägyptischen Königslisten (= Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Altertumskunde Aegyptens, 18). Berlin 1956.
- (710) JOSEPH HEINEMANN: 210 Years of Egyptian Exile: A Study in Midrashic Chronology. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 22, 1971, pp. 19–30.
- (711) SAMUEL E. LOEWENSTAMM: The Exodus from Egypt: A Literary Study Based on Comparison between the Report of the Book of Exodus and the Parallel Reports of the Extra-Pentateuchal Sources (in Hebrew). Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1960.
- (712) SAMUEL E. LOEWENSTAMM: The Tradition of the Exodus in Its Development (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1968.
- (713) ROGER LE DÉAUT: Miryam, sœur de Moïse, et Marie, mère du Messie. In: *Biblica* 45, 1964, pp. 198–219.
- (714) SIEGFRIED H. HORN and LYNN H. WOOD: The Chronology of Ezra 7; a report of the historical research committee of the General Conference of Seventh-Day Adventists. Washington 1953.
- (715) BRUCE J. MALINA: The Palestinian Manna Tradition: The Manna Tradition in the Palestinian Targums and Its Relationship to the New Testament Writings. Leiden 1968.
- (716) GÉZA VERMÈS: 'He is the Bread': Targum Neofiti Exodus 16. 15. In: EDWARD E. ELLIS and MAX WILCOX, edd., *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edinburgh 1969. Pp. 256–263.
- (717) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Le grand rideau du vestibule du temple de Jérusalem. In: *Syria* 35, 1958, pp. 218–226.
- (718) FELIPE MATEU Y LLOPIS: Ante una vieja polémica que Renace: Los Siclos de Israel. In: *Sefarad* 11, 1951, pp. 37–73.
- (719) LEIVY SMOLAR and MOSHE ABERBACH: The Golden Calf Episode in Postbiblical Literature. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 39, 1968, pp. 91–116.
- (720) GÜNTER MAYER, ed. and trans.: Die Mischna: Para (Die Rote Kuh) (VI. Seder: 4. Traktat). Berlin 1964.
- (721) HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE: The Presentation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1975. Publ. as: The Interpretation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Missoula, Montana 1976.
- (722) DANIEL J. HARRINGTON: Interpreting Israel's History: the *Testament of Moses* as a Rewriting of Deut. 31–34. In: GEORGE W. E. NICKELSBURG, ed., *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers for the Society of Biblical Literature Pseudepigrapha Group* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 4: Society of Biblical Literature, 1973). Pp. 59–70.

- (723) KLAUS HAACKER and PETER SCHÄFER: *Nachbiblische Traditionen vom Tod des Mose*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 147–174.
- (723a) GÉZA VERMÈS: *Post-Biblical Studies*. Leiden 1975.
- (723b) MADELEINE PETIT: À propos d'une traversée exemplaire du désert du Sinâi selon Philon (Hypothetica VI, 2, 3. 8): texte biblique et apologétique concernant Moïse chez quelques écrivains juifs. In: *Semitica* 26, 1976, pp. 137–142.
- (723c) TESSA RAJAK: Moses in Ethiopia: Legend and Literature. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29, 1978, pp. 111–122.
- (723d) OLIVER SHAW RANKIN: *Jewish Religious Polemic of Early and Later Centuries, a Study of Documents Here Rendered in English*. Edinburgh 1956; New York 1970.
- (723e) RENÉE BLOCH: Note méthodologique pour l'étude de la littérature rabbinique. In: *Recherches de Science religieuse* 43, 1955, pp. 194–227. Trans. into English by WILLIAM S. GREEN and WILLIAM J. SULLIVAN: *Methodological Note for the Study of Rabbinic Literature*. In: WILLIAM S. GREEN, ed., *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice* (Brown Judaic Studies, 1). Missoula, Montana 1978. Pp. 51–75.
- (723f) JOHN MACDONALD: *The Theology of the Samaritans*. London 1964.
- (723g) K. FERRARI D'OCCHIEPPO: *Der Stern der Weisen. Geschichte oder Legende*. Wien 1969; 2nd ed. 1977.
- (723h) TESSA RAJAK: *Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World*. Diss., 2 vols., Oxford 1974.
- (723i) CHARLES H. TALBERT: The Concept of Immortals in Mediterranean Antiquity. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, 1975, pp. 419–436.
- (723j) MARY R. GRAF: *The Hellenization of Moses*. Diss., Ph. D., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1976 (typewritten).
- (723k) AVIGDOR SHINAN: Moses and the Ethiopian Woman: Sources of a Story in *The Chronicles of Moses*. In: *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 27, 1978, pp. 66–78.

VON RANKE (698) presents a summary of Josephus' numerous additions to the Biblical narrative of Moses; but his notion that some of Josephus' additions passed over into the rabbinic writings is unacceptable, since Josephus is never mentioned by the rabbis and there is no evidence that they knew his works. Moreover, there is much indirect evidence in the Bible itself, notably in such books as Ruth and Daniel, of the antiquity of the oral tradition embodied in rabbinic tradition.

HALÉVY (699) surveys the question of the additions of Josephus and his sources and concludes that the chief supplement, the episode of Moses' military campaign in Ethiopia and his marriage to the Ethiopian princess, arose from his attempt to explain the passing allusion in the Bible (Numbers 12. 1) to the Cushite woman whom Moses married. RAPPAPORT (700), p. 117, n. 141, argues that HALÉVY, p. 114, is wrong in assuming that a single word 'Cushite' could have given rise to so far-reaching a legend, but rather that the legend leaned on this word. It is highly unlikely, we may remark, that Josephus originated this enormous tale, especially since in the extant fragments of the Hellenistic-Jewish historian Artapanus of the second quarter of the first century B.C.E. we have several extra-Biblical details (though not the romantic tale about the princess) found in Josephus, such as the statement that Moses was given command of the Egyptian troops by Pharaoh against the Ethiopians. In the twelfth century we find a story of Moses' campaign in Ethiopia and of his marriage with the widow

of the Ethiopian king in the Chronicles of Jerahmeel. A common and now lost source seems the most likely explanation for these generally agreeing but somewhat divergent traditions.

BIELER (701), vol. 1, pp. 18–19; vol. 2, pp. 30–34, emphasizes the extent to which Josephus' account of Moses conforms to the biography of a typical Hellenistic θεῖος ἄνθρωπος. We may comment that while this is true he does not go as far as Artapanus and Philo.

BRAUN (702) effectively examines Josephus' version of Moses as an example of a hero romance in the Hellenistic tradition. He notes that the stress on Moses as the great legislator of his people, while of course closely in line with Jewish tradition, is nonetheless also consonant with the Greek tradition that glorified Lycurgus and Solon because the giving of laws was central in their lives.

VERMÈS (703), in his survey of the portrayal of Moses in Josephus and in Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', suggests that one may trace the historical development of the aggadic tradition just as, he says, one may discern the development of Halakhic tradition. In view of the loss of most of our sources and the fact that our extant accounts, including Josephus, may and most probably do go back to more than one source, such a theory seems difficult to prove.

MEEKS (704), pp. 131–146, presenting an overall view of Moses in the writings of Josephus, concludes that Josephus has drawn from haggadic traditions but that at the same time he has given Moses the characteristic elements of the Hellenistic θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, though he avoids original elements.

TIEDE (705), pp. 207–240, suggests that rather than regard Josephus as making his Moses correspond to a general Hellenistic image of the θεῖος ἄνθρωπος, we should analyze the portrait to perceive those particular qualities which Josephus ascribes to Moses so as to make him as appealing as possible to his audience. He notes that unlike Artapanus Josephus abbreviates the Biblical catalogue of Moses' miracles and stresses the subordination of Moses to G-d in such activities. And yet, says TIEDE, in Josephus' statements about Moses as a law-giver he approaches divine status, since he calls him θεῖος ἄνθρωπος (Ant. 3. 180). We may comment that Josephus is here merely rendering the Bible's statement (Exodus 4. 16 and 7. 1) that Moses was as G-d to Aaron and to Pharaoh. TIEDE concludes that Josephus' Moses was a paradigm of the virtues of the ideal sage so highly prized in Roman society.

PERROT (706) studies the infancy narratives in the Bible, including that of Moses, as preserved in Jubilees, I Enoch, the Dead Sea 'Genesis Apocryphon', Philo, Josephus, and Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', and concludes that prior to the Christian era and the stories of the infancy of Jesus there existed a narrative tradition connected with the infancy of great Biblical heroes which may have had its genesis in the system of Scripture readings practiced in the land of Israel. PERROT, however, fails to consider that Josephus, at least, in his embellishments, may also have been influenced by the stories of the birth of Oedipus, the Persian king Cyrus, and the Roman Romulus among others.

SILVER (707) compares the accounts of Moses' Nubian campaign in Artapanus (ap. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9. 27) and Josephus (Ant. 2. 243–253), stressing four common elements in particular – Moses' generalship, Egypt-

tian duplicity, the ibis, and the Nubian woman. He concludes that these texts are part of a polemic against anti-Semitic attacks that had sought to downgrade Moses as a despicable traitor-priest who had served the devil Typhon-Seth. He suggests that Josephus uses the ibis, a symbol of Egyptian loyalty, to emphasize Moses' patriotism and that this use of the ibis reflects memories of an early syncretistic cult of the Egyptian Diaspora which centered on Moses as healer and intercessor. We may comment that the fact, cited by SILVER, that Moses' name is invoked in magical papyri does not, as he claims, indicate an early syncretism but rather a later syncretism which, in view of Moses' reputation in both the Bible and in Jewish oral tradition, associated him with magic powers.

The date of the Exodus was the subject of much dispute in antiquity, as WACHOLDER (708) has shown. According to Josephus (*Against Apion* 2. 17) Apion had dated the Exodus in 753 B.C.E., whereas the Church Fathers Tatian, Clement, and Eusebius attribute to Apion a synchronism of Moses, Inachus, and Amosis and hence a date of 1976 B.C.E. He suggests that Josephus and the Fathers may be quoting different parts of Apion's work, but this would still leave Apion contradicting himself within a comparatively short work; and, moreover, Josephus takes the trouble to compare Apion's date with those of Manetho, Lysimachus and Apollonius Molon. Inasmuch as he is eager to refute the theory that the Exodus took place recently and to prove that Moses' claim to real antiquity is well-founded it would have been to his advantage to show that Apion had contradicted himself — and this Josephus does not do. A more likely hypothesis, we may suggest, is that Apion was interpolated by various redactors. Alternatively we may theorize that a work circulated under Apion's name which better suited the chronology of the Fathers or that they had confused Apion with one of the several other Egyptian anti-Semitic writers on the Exodus. For a systematic consideration of Josephus' chronology, as compared with that of Africanus, Eusebius, and Sothis, see HELCK (709), pp. 36–38 and 62–64, on the Hyksos, and pp. 38–46 and 64–72, on the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Dynasties.

HEINEMANN (710) notes that whereas the midrashic tradition (*Genesis Rabbah* 91. 2) and Pseudo-Philo (*Biblical Antiquities* 9. 3) state that Jacob descended to Egypt 210 years before the Exodus, Josephus gives the number as 215. The *Pentateuch* (*Exodus* 12. 40) gives the total number of years between Abraham's descent into Egypt and the Exodus as 430; and one is tempted to think that Josephus has conveniently but arbitrarily divided this 430-year period into exactly equal periods. But HEINEMANN shows that the rabbinic tractate *Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer* 48 may give us a clue to the fact that Josephus has an alternate tradition, namely that five years before Jacob descended to Egypt Joseph's two sons were born to him. That this is indeed an old and authentic tradition is verified by the fact that the Samaritan midrash *'Memar Marqah'* also states that the Exodus took place 215 years after Jacob's descent into Egypt. We may add that, interestingly enough, the Talmud (*Megillah* 9a) lists *Exodus* 12. 40 as one of the passages in which the translators of the Septuagint were authorized to change the text, so that they wrote that the Israelites spent 430 years in Egypt "and in other lands" (our Septuagint has added "in the land of Canaan," and

the Alexandrian manuscript adds "they and their fathers"). Apparently the passage was a crux and subject to various traditions.

LOEWENSTAMM (711) (712) presents an exhaustive comparison of the Biblical account of the Exodus, particularly the plagues and the splitting of the Red Sea, with those of the rabbis and the Graeco-Jewish (including Philo, Pseudo-Philo, and Josephus) and Gentile writers. He does not give sufficient weight to reasons which may have led Josephus to alter the Biblical version, namely his apologetic concerns in addressing his Greek audience.

LE DÉAUT (713) surveys the treatment of Miriam in Josephus and in Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' and comments that Josephus, like Ezekiel, the Hellenistic Jewish tragedian of the first century B.C.E., reports without comment the activities of Miriam in saving her brother.

HORN and WOOD (714) comment on Antiquities 1. 81, where Josephus refers to Exodus 12. 2 on Moses' instituting the month of Nisan as the beginning of the year for ecclesiastical purposes, in contrast to the beginning of the civil year.

MALINA (715), p. 54, notes close resemblances between the language of Josephus (Ant. 3. 26–32) in his description of the manna and in his exegesis of the place name Gilgal, on the one hand, and the language of the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan and that of Targum Neofiti and a manuscript fragment of a Palestinian Targum to the prophets in the library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of New York, on the other hand. He concludes that Josephus was probably dependent upon a Targum; but the instances are few and may reflect merely the fact that Aramaic was Josephus' mother-tongue.

VERMÈS (716), commenting on Antiquities 3. 26, likewise notes the similarity with Pseudo-Philo, the New Testament, the Targum Neofiti, and rabbinic sources.

PELLETIER (717) cites Antiquities 14. 105 for the textual criticism of the Septuagint version of Exodus 22. 36.

MATEU Y LLOPIS (718) comments on Antiquities 3. 195, which states that the Hebrew shekel is equivalent to four Attic drachmas.

SMOLAR and ABERBACH (719) suggest that Josephus omitted the story of the golden calf (Exodus 32) for apologetic reasons, especially since Josephus, himself a priest, sought to avoid anything that might be disparaging to the reputation of the high priest Aaron, who was directly involved. We may here note, however, that the Mishnah (Megillah 4. 10) lists the second account of the Golden Calf (Exodus 32. 21–25) as one of the passages to be read but not translated in the synagogue. The Gemara (Megillah 25a) on this passage raises the possibility that perhaps we should abstain from reading the first account (Exodus 23. 1–20) out of respect for Israel, but rules against it. Perhaps, we may suggest, Josephus followed a tradition which ruled otherwise.

MAYER (720), pp. 15–16, compares Josephus' account (Ant. 4. 78–82) of the rite of the Red Heifer with the Biblical version (Numbers 19) and concludes that Josephus' changes are due to the fact that he is addressing a Graeco-Roman audience. This is often so, we may remark, but in this instance, however, the changes may be explained in one case (Ant. 4. 79) by the fact that he is



following a reading of the Septuagint and in other places by noting that he is following traditions paralleled in extant midrashim.

ATTRIDGE (721) contends that in his paraphrase of the accounts of the desert revolts and of the settlement of Canaan in Books 4 and 5 of the 'Antiquities' Josephus presents a most emphatic ethical interpretation. Josephus here contrasts the excellence of the Mosaic 'aristocratic' constitution with the tyranny of individuals who are overcome by passions and that of the state headed by such rulers.

HARRINGTON (722) compares the Hebrew text of Deuteronomy 31–34 with Jubilees, Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', and Josephus (Ant. 4. 302–331) and notes that both Pseudo-Philo and Josephus retain the apostasy-punishment-vindication scheme of Deuteronomy 31–32, while Jubilees 1 refines the pattern by inserting 'repentance'. Josephus is distinctive in looking upon the pattern as continuing in Israel's history rather than as a single event.

HAACKER and SCHÄFER (723) compare the account of the death of Moses in Josephus with that in Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', the 'Assumption of Moses', the 'Memar Marqah', and rabbinic literature. They note that in Josephus, even more strongly than in Deuteronomy, the law is presented as the personal legacy of Moses. In the description of Moses' death the Stoic influences are unmistakable. They note that Josephus' account of the death of Moses has traditional motifs found in the description of the death of great heroes, such as Heracles and Romulus.

VERMÈS (723a), p. 143, notes that Josephus (Ant. 3. 26–27) incorporates two significant haggadic elements, that the heavenly food was obtained only through Moses, and that he was the first to receive it and subsequently gave it to the astonished Israelites, who had imagined it to be snow.

PETIT (723b) notes that Philo's *Hypothetica* 6. 2. 3. 8, in its portrait of Moses guiding the Israelites through the wilderness, contradicts the Bible in a number of respects and highlights the Stoic idea of the incorporeality of the virtue of the wise man. She cites briefly, as parallels in this fashioning of an ideal image of Moses, the writings of Artapanus, Josephus, and Ezekiel the tragedian. As examples of Josephus' suppressions of the Biblical text PETIT cites the death of the Egyptian (Ex. 2. 11–12) and the golden calf (Ex. 32).

RAJAK (732c) concludes that it is probable, if not certain, that Josephus' source for his account of Moses' expedition against Ethiopia was an Alexandrian Jewish written work, since some of the material does not suit him well, it being unlikely that he carried in his head the details about ibises, Ethiopia, and Meroe that are found in his narrative. She says that Josephus' source was written prior to Artapanus, and that both this source and Artapanus probably drew upon a common fund of oral and written material. And yet, RAJAK admits that there is no evidence elsewhere in Josephus' Moses narrative that he was dependent upon an Alexandrian or, for that matter, any other written source. We may comment that, in view of the greater emphasis on the oral transmission of such midrashic traditions during this period it is at least as likely that Josephus drew directly upon an oral source. The fact that elements of the story appear in the Targumim shows that we are dealing with an oral tradition independent of Alexandria.

RAJAK says that here is the best way of explaining the complex relationship between Josephus and Artapanus and the rich, inventive detail found in both; but her case is entirely conjectural, and she has no conclusive evidence. Indeed, she has failed to examine Josephus' technique in retelling other Biblical episodes and hence does not consider the possibility that Josephus introduced details of his own, presumably for apologetic reasons. Moreover, the fact, we may add, that Josephus is a 'literary' account influenced by the ethnographic tradition shows not necessarily that he had a literary source but that he himself revised it.

RANKIN (723d), pp. 9–11 and 14–15, notes parallels between the depiction of Moses in Josephus and in the Hebrew 'Chronicle of Moses', written during the early Middle Ages, particularly in the portrayal of Moses as a military leader in the period before the Exodus from Egypt. Noting that Josephus (Ant. 2. 347) declares that he has recounted each detail just as he found it in the sacred books, RANKIN concludes that, since Josephus has added numerous details that are not found in the Biblical narrative, the sacred books here mentioned must be midrashic works which were extant in Josephus' day. We may add that a work such as the Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon, which certainly antedates Josephus, indicates that there were indeed written midrashim prior to Josephus.

BLOCH (723e), showing the evolution of a tradition, analyzes various rabbinic versions of Pharaoh's dream and of the prediction of one of the Egyptian scribes (Ant. 2. 205) that a child would be born to the Israelites who would overthrow the Egyptian sovereignty.

MACDONALD (723f), p. 189, notes the similarity between the medieval Samaritan account of the discovery by Pharaoh's daughter of the infant Moses, whereupon she was cured of a disease upon beholding his radiance, and the account in Josephus of the princess' discovery of Moses (Ant. 2. 224–237). We may comment that this corroborates the view that the Samaritans, despite their ostensible rejection of the Oral Law, retained oral traditions, especially those of a midrashic sort.

FERRARI D'OCCHIEPPO (723g), p. 13, comments on the affinity between the story (Ant. 2. 205–209) of the birth of Moses after an Egyptian sacred scribe had predicted the birth of an Israelite child who would abase Egyptian sovereignty and the orders given by the Egyptian pharaoh to destroy all male children born to the Israelites, on the one hand, and the story of the birth of Jesus and the slaughter of the innocents, on the other hand.

I have not seen RAJAK (732h), who discusses Josephus' treatment of Moses, or her Appendix V, comparing Antiquities 2 and 3 with the Septuagint version of Exodus.

TALBERT (723i) comments, in particular, on the rumors that Moses, during his second absence of forty days, had been taken back to the Deity (Ant. 3. 96), that Moses was a man of G-d (Ant. 3. 180), and that Moses, upon his death, went back to the Deity (Ant. 4. 436). He compares the account of Moses' death to that of Aeneas and Romulus and says that this echoes the 'death-ascension' aspect of the mythology of the immortals among other peoples. He postulates that Josephus knew of a Jewish tradition of the end of Moses' career that spoke of his passing in terms peculiar to those found among other Mediterranean

peoples. We may comment that it is precisely as a reaction against such a view that the Bible and Josephus insist that Moses died.

I have not seen GRAF (723j), pp. 131–144, who discusses the portrait of Moses in Josephus.

SHINAN (723k) compares Josephus' account of Moses' Ethiopian campaign (Ant. 2. 239–253) with the versions in Artapanus, Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, 'The Chronicle of Moses', and 'Sefer ha-Yashar'.

### 10.9: Manetho, the Hyksos, and the Exodus

- (724) EDUARD MEYER: *Aegyptische Chronologie*. Berlin 1904.
- (725) RICHARD LAQUEUR: Manethon (1). In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 14. 1, 1928, cols. 1060–1101.
- (726) ISAAK HEINEMANN: Antisemitismus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband 5, 1931, cols. 3–43.
- (727) WILLIAM G. WADDELL, ed. and trans.: *Manetho* (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1940.
- (728) ALBRECHT ALT: Die Herkunft der Hyksos in neuer Sicht. In: *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Bd. 101, Heft 6, 1954. Reissued in: *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Vol. 3. München 1959. Pp. 72–98.
- (729) PAHOR C. LABIB: *Die Herrschaft der Hyksos in Ägypten und ihr Sturz*. Diss., Berlin 1934. Publ.: Glückstadt 1936.
- (730) ARTHUR ALLGEIER, *Biblische Zeitgeschichte in den Grundlinien dargestellt*. Freiburg 1937.
- (731) ROBERT M. ENGBERG: *The Hyksos Reconsidered* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, no. 18; originally issued as the author's dissertation, University of Chicago, 1937). Chicago 1939.
- (732) ÉTIENNE DRIOTON and JACQUES VANDIER: *Les peuples de l'Orient Méditerranéen. II: L'Égypte*. Paris 1938.
- (733) PIERRE MONTET: Le roi Amenophis et les Impurs. In: *Revue des Études anciennes* 42, 1940 (= *Mélanges Radet*), pp. 263–269.
- (734) PAUL COLLOMP: Manéthon et le nom du nome où fut Avaris. In: *Revue des Études anciennes* 42, 1940 (= *Mélanges Radet*), pp. 74–85.
- (735) HERBERT E. WINLOCK: *The Rise and Fall of the Middle Kingdom in Thebes*. New York 1947.
- (736) JACQUES SCHWARTZ: Le 'cycle de Petoubastis' et les commentaires égyptiens de l'Exode. In: *Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 49, 1949, pp. 67–83.
- (737) JOHN A. WILSON: *The Burden of Egypt*. Chicago 1951.
- (738) JEAN BÉRARD: Les Hyksos et la Légende d'Io. In: *Recherches sur la période prémycénienne*. In: *Syria* 29, 1952, pp. 1–43.
- (739) ALAN H. GARDINER: *Egypt of the Pharaohs*. Oxford 1961.
- (740) HANS WOLFGANG HELCK: *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, 5). Wiesbaden 1962.
- (741) ALBRECHT ALT: *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 3 vols. München 1953–59. Trans. (selections) into English by R. A. WILSON: *Essays on Old Testament and Religion*. Oxford 1966.
- (742) JOHN VAN SETERS: *The Hyksos: A New Investigation*. New Haven 1966.

- (743) DONALD B. REDFORD: *History and Chronology of the Eighteenth Dynasty of Egypt: Seven Studies*. Toronto 1967.
- (744) JOHN G. GAGER: *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Society of Biblical Literature, Monograph Series, 16). Nashville, Tennessee 1972.
- (744a) JAMES T. SHOTWELL: *The History of History*. Vol. 1. Rev. ed., New York 1939.
- (744b) PIERRE MONTET: *Le drame d'Avaris. Essai sur la pénétration des Sémites en Égypte*. Paris 1941.
- (744c) ERIK HORNING: *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte des Neuen Reiches (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, edd. WOLFGANG HELCK and EBERHARD OTTO, Bd. 11)*. Wiesbaden 1964.
- (744d) ARYEH KASHER: *The Propaganda Purposes of Manetho's Libellous Story about the Base Origin of the Jews* (in Hebrew). In: B. ODED, et al., *Mehkarim: Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel* 3, Haifa 1974, pp. 69–84.
- (744e) ARYEH KASHER: *Les Circonstances de la promulgation de l'édit de l'empereur Claude et de sa lettre aux Alexandrins* (41 ap. J.-C.). In: *Semitica* 26, 1976, pp. 99–108.
- (744f) LUCIO TROIANI: *Sui frammenti di Manetone nel primo libro del Contra Apionem di Flavio Giuseppe*. In: *Studi Classici e Orientali* 24, 1975, pp. 97–126.
- (744g) RAOUL MORTLEY: *L'historiographie profane et les pères*. In: *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*. Paris 1978. Pp. 315–327.
- (744h) G. I. DAVIES: *The Way of the Wilderness: A Geographical Study of the Wilderness Itineraries in the Old Testament* (Society for Old Testament Study, Monograph Series, 5). Cambridge 1979.
- (744i) JACK FINEGAN: *Archaeological History of the Ancient Middle East*. Boulder, Colorado 1978.

Josephus (Against Apion 1. 73–92) presents at some length, alternately quoting and paraphrasing, Manetho's account of the Hyksos, whom Josephus equates with the ancestors of the Israelites, as evidence of the historicity of the Exodus. Inasmuch as the works of Manetho have been lost, these fragments assume great importance. There has long been debate as to the authenticity of these fragments.

MEYER (724), 71–79, in his monumental work on Egyptian chronology, concludes that the text of Manetho originally contained no reference to the Jews but that it was later grossly interpolated.

LAQUEUR (725) and HEINEMANN (726) subsequently adopted this view and argue that the authentic Manetho had actually written of the persecutions instituted by the henotheistic Pharaoh Amenhotep IV (Akhenaten).

WADDELL (727), pp. xv–xvi, adopts LAQUEUR's thesis and suggests that a rationalistic critique of the genuine Manetho was written by a Hellenist and used by Josephus for his work, that Josephus originally knew only the genuine Manetho, but that later he came to know the interpolated Manetho and radically changed his attitude toward him, now attacking him sharply.

ALT (728) says that Manetho's tradition was influenced by invasions of Egypt subsequent to the Hyksos and that Josephus' description of the Hyksos as ancestors of the Israelites is without any basis in the native Egyptian tradition and is clearly a secondary speculation of the Hellenistic period.

It is true, we may reply, that Manetho, as quoted by Josephus, never specifically identifies the Hyksos and the Israelites; but the statement that upon leaving Egypt they went to Judaea and built the city of Jerusalem would certainly

be understood in his time (third century B.C.E.) as referring to the Jews. There is, we may add, enough in common between 'Manetho' and 'Hecataeus' to indicate the presence of a common tradition of Jewish presence in and departure from Egypt. There is no evidence that Josephus had access to more than one version of Manetho; in *Against Apion* 1. 237, where he returns to Manetho after leaving him in *Against Apion* 1. 105, Josephus specifically says that it is the same Manetho "whose evidence has already served me a little way back to prove our antiquity."

LABIB (729), co-ordinating the account of Manetho with the artifacts found by the archaeologists, concludes that Josephus (*Against Apion* 1. 82–83) was right in dismissing the theory that the Hyksos were Arabs.

ALLGEIER (730), pp. 35–36, notes the name *I'kb*, corresponding presumably to the name Jacob, among the Hyksos, and concludes that at least some of the Hyksos were Semites.

ENGBERG (731), pp. 4–6, cautiously concludes, on the basis of recent archaeological findings, that there was a strong Semitic element in the Hyksos.

DRIOTON and VANDIER (732), pp. 280–295, 317–318, co-ordinate the account of Manetho as cited in Josephus with the inscriptions.

MONTET (733) argues for the historicity of Manetho's account (*Against Apion* 1. 227–266), citing the monuments of Sîn el Hagar.

Individual details may be questioned, as, for example, the statement (*Against Apion* 1. 78) discussed by COLLOMP (734), locating Avaris, the Hyksos stronghold, in the Saite rather than in the Sethroite nome, as Manetho would have it.

WINLOCK (735), pp. 96–99, notes that both Josephus and Africanus state that there were six Hyksos kings, and that this is confirmed by a papyrus of the reign of Rameses II. The papyrus, however, says that they ruled 108 years, whereas Josephus and Africanus, he says, exaggerate in giving 259 years as the length of their dynasty.

SCHWARTZ' (736) attempt to discount the validity of Josephus' effort to corroborate through Manetho the Biblical version of the Exodus seems extreme in view of the variety of accounts emanating from Hellenistic Egypt confirming the Exodus but giving it an anti-Semitic tinge.

WILSON (737), pp. 154–165, concludes that Josephus' account is tendentious, since he wishes to equate the Hyksos and the Israelites, but that after we discount some of the particulars there is still a good deal of truth in the picture of conquerors of unknown race building walled camps from which to rule Egypt, opposing the Egyptian religion, and ultimately being forced to retire to Asia.

BÉRARD (738) compares the accounts of the Hyksos kings as listed in Josephus, Africanus, Eusebius, Sothis (Syncellus), and the Turin papyrus, and finds traces of legendary personages, notably Epaphos the descendant of Io.

GARDINER (739), pp. 155–173, examines the accuracy of a number of details in Manetho's account, concluding that 'Manetho' was mistaken in some respects but well informed in others. He discounts the etymology of Hyksos as 'king-shepherds' (*Against Apion* 1. 82) and asserts that the correct etymology is

from *hikkhase*, 'chieftain of a foreign hill-country.' But the account of Avaris is valid. He ascribes this alternation of truth and falsity to an established convention in Egyptian historical writing, painting a period of anarchy in exaggeratedly lurid colors in order to glorify the king that followed.

HELCK (740), pp. 92–97, while strongly supporting Manetho's testimony regarding the Hyksos, insists that the archaeological evidence cannot be used to identify them.

ALT (741), p. 140 (English version), notes that Manetho (ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 82) is certainly wrong in stating that the Hyksos originated in Arabia, since they arose either in Syria or somewhere even further north, inasmuch as it is from there that they learned the use of horses and chariots.

VAN SETERS (742), pp. 121–126, systematically compares Josephus' account of Manetho with the accounts in Africanus, Eusebius, and the Scholia of Plato, and concludes that there is no ground for supporting HELCK's confidence in the Josephan version of Manetho. VAN SETERS favors the use of archaeological evidence and of tactical considerations; he argues that it was impossible for a foreign people with no previous contact with Egypt to become so completely assimilated without leaving any trace of its own culture.

REDFORD (743), pp. 209–210, says that Manetho (ap. *Against Apion* 1. 231), who speaks of Sethos expelling Hermaeus and ruling Egypt, contradicts *Antiquities* 1. 100–101, which speaks of an insurrection on the part of Hermaeus and implies that Sethos was already ruling when the revolt took place, and that thus Josephus reflects a contaminated tradition. But, we may reply, there is no necessary contradiction: Josephus says merely that Sethos expelled Hermaeus and ruled; he does not say in *Against Apion* 1. 231 that he had not been ruling previously.

GAGER (744), pp. 113–118, concludes that in its present form the material in Josephus must be assigned to an anonymous anti-Jewish Alexandrian writer; but this, he correctly admits, does not preclude the likelihood that it contains authentic traditions embedded within it.

SHOTWELL (744a), pp. 85–87 and 102–103, commenting on the fragments of Manetho in Josephus (*Against Apion* 1. 73–82, 1. 128ff.), concludes that Manetho's work was one of wide scholarship and that the monuments show that he had at his disposal relatively accurate data.

MONTET (744b), pp. 173–177, concludes that *Against Apion* 1. 227–277, which is drawn from Manetho, is clear and coherent and inspires confidence; the fact that Josephus is obscure has led Egyptologists to suspect Manetho's narrative.

HORNUNG (744c), pp. 30–41, concludes that Josephus' citations of Manetho have a positive reliability and that his list of dynasties goes back to a trustworthy source. In general, he (pp. 84–85, 95–96) asserts, Josephus is confirmed in his chronology; but each citation must be confirmed from other sources. He concludes that Josephus' figures as to the length of the reigns of the pharaohs are more reliable than those of Africanus and of Eusebius.

KASHER (744d) concludes that Manetho, in his account of the Hyksos' invasion of Egypt (ap. *Against Apion* 1. 73–90) and in his calumny that the

Israelites who left Egypt were lepers, was motivated by a desire to counteract the Ptolemies' intellectual interest in the Jews and in their Scriptures, their general favoritism toward the Jews, and their discrimination against the native Egyptians by attempting to discredit the Biblical tradition through engaging in a propaganda campaign against the Jews. Thus Manetho used the well-known ethnographic technique of portraying the Jews as being of base origin, of being rebellious by nature, of hating non-Jews, and of disbelieving in the gods.

KASHER (744e) similarly suggests that Manetho is trying to answer charges against the Egyptians in the Septuagint.

TROIANI (744f) concludes that Manetho, in his account of the Hyksos' invasion, is thinking of the descent into Egypt of Jacob and his sons, and that his account of the second invasion reflects a popular patriotic and apocalyptic Egyptian tradition. Hence Manetho's anti-Semitism is not the product of later interpolations but is authentic.

MORTLEY (744g), pp. 319–324, discusses Manetho as a propagandist.

DAVIES (744h) notes that, according to Apion 1. 73–105 and 1. 227–2. 32, a very northerly point of departure for the Hyksos, with whom Josephus identifies the Israelites, is envisaged. In this Josephus is following a tradition found in Manetho and in Chaeremon.

FINEGAN (744i), p. 261, notes that, as transmitted by Josephus, Africanus, and Eusebius, the lists of Manetho of the Eighteenth Dynasty exhibit considerable confusion.

## 10.10: The Sojourn of the Israelites in the Wilderness

- (744j) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: Josephus' Account of the Story of Israel's Sin with Alien Women in the Country of Midian (Num. 25. 1ff.), in: M. S. H. G. HEERMA VAN VOSS, ed., *Travels in the World of the Old Testament: Studies Presented to Professor M. A. Beek* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica, 16). Assen 1974. Pp. 241–261.
- (744k) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, trans. and ed.: *Josephus*, vol. 4 (Jewish Antiquities, Books 1–4). London and Cambridge, Mass., Loeb Classical Library, 1930.
- (744l) JUDITH R. BASKIN: Reflections of Attitudes towards the Gentiles in Jewish and Christian Exegesis of Jethro, Balaam and Job. Diss., Yale University, New Haven 1976.
- (744m) MADELEINE PETIT: A propos d'une traversée exemplaire du désert du Sinäi selon Philon (Hypothetica VI, 2–3, 8): texte biblique et apologétique concernant Moïse chez quelques écrivains juifs. In: *Semitica* 26, 1976, pp. 137–142.
- (744n) LARRY MOSCOVITZ: Josephus' Treatment of the Biblical Balaam Episode. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York 1979. 61 pp.
- (744o) PIERRE GRELOT: Quatre cents trente ans (Ex 12, 40). In: *Homenaje a Juan Prado: miscelánea de estudios bíblicos y hebraicos*. Edd. L. ALVAREZ VERDES and E. J. ALONSO HERNÁNDEZ. Madrid 1975. Pp. 559–570.
- (744p) JOSEPH HEINEMANN: 210 Years of Egyptian Exile: A Study in Midrashic Chronology. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 22, 1971, pp. 19–30.
- (744q) G. I. DAVIES: *The Way of the Wilderness: A Geographical Study of the Wilderness Itineraries in the Old Testament* (Society for Old Testament Study, Monograph Series, 5). Cambridge 1979.

VAN UNNIK (744j) notes that the episode of Phinehas is retold without being expanded, whereas the story of the Israelites' harlotry with the Midianite woman is expanded upon and includes four speeches, none of which has a Biblical basis; hence this passage largely reflects Josephus' own ideas, particularly in the building up of Moses' eagerness to win back the trespassers. Philo, on the other hand, dealing with the same passage, has a more psychological and philosophical tone and stresses the evil of the lust. He disputes the suggestion of THACKERAY (744k), pp. 540–541, that Josephus' model was Herodotus 4. 111ff., since the similarity is only superficial. Finally, VAN UNNIK comments on the striking connection between *Against Apion* 2. 173 and *Antiquities* 4. 146 and notes that Josephus' treatment gives us a clear insight into Israel's struggle for its identity in the first century C.E. We may comment that it is not warranted to conclude that Josephus was presenting his own ideas merely because there is no Biblical parallel, since he may well reflect here, as elsewhere, midrashic stories, many of which we know were lost.

I have not seen BASKIN (744l), who surveys Jethro, Balaam, and Job in rabbinic, Hellenistic Jewish, and patristic exegesis down to 600 C.E.

Commenting on the description of Moses' guidance of Israel through the wilderness in Philo's *Hypothetica*, PETIT (744m) notes that the device of presenting an ideal image of Moses, while neglecting or even contradicting elements in the Biblical text, is also found in Artapanus, Josephus, and the Hellenistic Jewish tragedian Ezekiel. She cites as an example of basic modification of the Biblical text the omission by Josephus of the incident of the golden calf (*Exodus* 32).

MOSCOVITZ (744n), in an unusually strong master's thesis, concludes that Josephus, most probably out of apologetic considerations, gives a straightforward and relatively unbiased portrait of Balaam. He interprets the passage not as a study of Balaam's personality but as the story of a political and military conflict between Israel and her adversaries. Josephus uses the oracles of Balaam as a medium to convey his own hopes for the future of the Jewish people and for their ultimate sovereignty over the world. His discussion of Balaam's prophecy is relatively free of real theological elements and true hellenizations; it is essentially a study in rhetoric.

GRELOT (744o) notes that according to *Exodus* 12. 40 the Israelite sojourn in Egypt was 430 years, whereas according to the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint the sojourn of the Israelites and of their fathers in Canaan and in Egypt lasted 430 years. The recent publication of the *Testament of Amram*, found in fragmentary form in Grotto 4 at Qumran, fits in with the chronology of the Aramaic *Testament of Levi*, which places the descent into Egypt 215 years after the arrival of Abraham in Canaan. He concludes that the Samaritan text is thus to be preferred to the Masoretic Text. We may comment that the Rabbis were also aware of the chronological problem and that, according to their tradition, the Israelites were in Egypt for a period of 210 years (so also in *Pseudo-Philo, Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* 9. 3). Indeed, they list (*Megillah* 9a) as one of the changes, divinely inspired, made by the translators of the Septuagint the addition of the phrase "and in other lands" after "the Israelites



dwelt in Egypt 430 years." The number 215 (found also, we may add, in the Samaritan Midrash 'Memar Marqah'), we may suggest, was arbitrarily arrived at by dividing 430 in two, since the Samaritan and Septuagint texts state that the Israelites spent 430 years in Canaan and Egypt. On this question GRELOT should have consulted HEINEMANN (744p).

DAVIES (744q), pp. 7–13, concludes that for the Israelites' route in the Wilderness Josephus is not as dependent as is Philo upon the Septuagint, and that he may have had access to revisions of the Septuagint which recent textual study has shown to have been in existence already in the first century C.E. He comments, in particular, on *Antiquities* 2.324–325, which goes far beyond Exodus 14 in suggesting a southerly route. Josephus' view as to the location of Mount Sinai (*Ant.* 3.76), he notes, is that it is probably in the northeast of the peninsula, but that it may be elsewhere in the peninsula, possibly even in the south.

### 10.11: Joshua and Judges

- (745) ABRAM SPIRO: Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo. In: *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 20, 1951, pp. 279–355.
- (746) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (747) CAROLYN OSIEK and ED. REWOLINSKI: *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Pseudo-Philonis: The Joshua Narrative XX–XXIV*. In: *New Testament Seminar of Prof. John Strugnell, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. Fall 1971. No. 3. Unpublished.*
- (748) ELENA CASSIN: Note sur le 'Commerce de Carrefour' en Mésopotamie Ancienne. In: *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 4, 1961, pp. 164–167.
- (749) DONALD J. WISEMAN: Rahab of Jericho. In: *Tyndale House Bulletin* 14, June 1964, pp. 8–11.
- (750) ZECHARIA KALLAI: The Biblical Geography of Flavius Josephus. In: *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Proceedings. The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 25 July – 1 Aug. 1965 (Jerusalem 1967). Vol. 1, pp. 203–207. Hebrew version in: Eretz-Israel* 8, 1967, pp. 269–272.
- (751) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Die Eroberungen des Alexander Jannäus in Moab. In: *Theokratia* 1, 1967–69, pp. 3–50.
- (752) ANTONIUS VAN DALE: *Dissertatio super Aristeia*. Amsterdam 1705.
- (753) ISAC L. SEELIGMANN: Menschliches Heldentum und göttliche Hilfe. In: *Theologische Zeitschrift* 19, 1963, pp. 385–411.

SPIRO (745), comparing Josephus and Pseudo-Philo in their treatment of Joshua, notes that at times they are in agreement and concludes, following HÖLSCHER (746), that for the 'Antiquities' Josephus used neither a Hebrew nor a Greek text but a secondary source written by a Jewish Hellenist. But, we may reply, this merely shifts the problem of Josephus' sources by creating a single source 'x' when our extant sources, which are so incomplete, fail us.

OSIEK and REWOLINSKI (747), in an unpublished paper, conclude that there is a basic difference between Pseudo-Philo and Josephus in their treatment of the Joshua narrative in that the former, like the 'Samaritan Chronicle', tendentiously

alters the events for doctrinal reasons, whereas Josephus adheres rather rigorously to the Biblical account since his history is not theologically oriented.

CASSIN (748) notes that Rahab of Joshua 2. 1 is depicted by Josephus (Ant. 5. 7) as an innkeeper, whereas the Hebrew text describes her as a prostitute and comments that the same double function is to be seen in ancient Mesopotamia.

WISEMAN (749) also notes this, as well as the fact that the Targum and Midrash similarly depict her as an innkeeper. We may here note a parallel in Judges 16. 1, where the text reads that Samson saw a harlot and went in to her, whereas Josephus (Ant. 5. 304) says that Samson came to Gaza and lodged at one of the inns.

We may also note that there is a similar *double entendre* in the Talmudic tale (Sotah 47a) of Rabbi Joshua ben Perahia and one of his disciples (Jesus, according to some manuscripts) at an inn in Egypt. Rabbi Joshua remarks, "How beautiful is this *'aksaniab* ('inn')," but the disciple understands this Aramaic word in the sense of 'female innkeeper.'

KALLAI (750), who analyzes Josephus' descriptions of Joshua's tribal allotments (Ant. 5. 80ff.) and of Solomon's districts (Ant. 8. 35ff.), concludes that he did not rely upon independent traditions and that his Biblical text was more closely akin to the Hebrew Masorah than to the Septuagint, but that he rendered the Biblical descriptions in his own terms, some schematically, using geographical concepts that were current in his own time, and without any effort at accuracy in reconstructing the Biblical description. This, we may add, fits in with Josephus' procedure elsewhere, for example, where he lists the Moabite towns occupied by Alexander Jannaeus, anachronistically identifying them with the lists in Isaiah 15 and Jeremiah 48 (see SCHALIT [751]).

Though it is old, VAN DALE's (752) work, which analyzes, pp. 88–97, Josephus' account of the birth of Samson and speculates on the apologetic motives that may have guided him, is still well worth study.

SEELIGMANN (753) stresses the haughtiness of Samson in Josephus' portrait (Ant. 5. 301); he might have gone further and noted several striking resemblances between this portrayal and that of Achilles in Homer. In the Samson narrative especially, we may add, Josephus' embellishments, particularly when compared with those of the rabbinic midrashim and Pseudo-Philo, represent Josephus' personal imprint more than they do a Palestinian Midrashic tradition; for the motifs found in his additions occur in his embellishments of many other Biblical narratives as well.

## 10.12: Ruth

(753a) D. R. G. BEATTIE: Jewish Exegesis of the Book of Ruth (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplement Series, vol. 2). Sheffield, England 1977.

(753b) MOSHE J. BERNSTEIN: Josephus as a Biblical Exegete: The Ruth Narrative (Yeshiva University, New York, unpublished, 1980).

BEATTIE (753a), pp. 18–19, states that there is no clear evidence that Josephus (Ant. 5. 318–337) used a Greek text for Ruth. He concludes, though

with little evidence, that his account is generally in agreement with the exegesis of early rabbinic Judaism. He adds, p. 169, that Josephus' comments are merely bits of narrative woven into his free rendering of the Biblical story. He fails to even consider why Josephus did not embellish the story in the way that we should expect from one who loved narratives with erotic elements.

BERNSTEIN (753b), commenting on *Antiquities* 5.318–337, notes that Josephus has vitiated the vivid dialogue, which is one of the outstanding features of the Biblical text, by telling most of the story in the third person, that he has de-emphasized the role of Ruth by failing to stress her quality of *hesed*, that he has failed to take advantage of the potential eroticism in the story of the meeting of Boaz and Ruth at the threshing-floor, and that he omits all mention of G-d from the narrative. BERNSTEIN explains this by noting that Josephus is aware that the inclusion of the Book of Ruth in the Biblical canon is due to the genealogy of David with which it concludes, and that he therefore minimizes this digression into the fortunes of an obscure family. We may, however, comment that the chief reason for the de-emphasis is that Josephus is retelling the Bible primarily as a historian; and the story itself is of little importance for the history of the Israelites.

### 10.13: Josephus' Biblical Text for Samuel through I Maccabees

- (754) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: Note on the Evidence of Josephus. In: ALAN E. BROOKE, NORMAN MCLEAN, and HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed., *The Old Testament in Greek*, vol. 2, part 1: 1 and 2 Samuel. Cambridge 1927. P. ix.
- (755) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (756) SIDNEY JELICOE: *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. Oxford 1968.
- (757) ADAM MEZ: *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie*. Basel 1895.
- (758) JAMES A. MONTGOMERY: *The Book of Kings* (Henry S. Gehman, ed., *International Critical Commentary*). New York 1951.
- (759) JOHN WEVERS: *Proto-Septuagint Studies*. In: WILLIAM S. MCCULLOUGH, ed., *The Seed of Wisdom: Essays in Honour of Theophile J. Meek*. Toronto 1964, Pp. 58–77.
- (760) BO JOHNSON: *Die Armenische Bibelübersetzung als hexaplarischer Zeuge im 1. Samuelbuch*. Lund 1968.
- (761) SIDNEY JELICOE: *The Occasion and Purpose of the Letter of Aristeas: A Re-examination*. In: *New Testament Studies* 12, 1965–66, pp. 144–150.
- (762) GEORGE F. MOORE: *The Antiochian Recension of the Septuagint*. In: *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 29, 1912–13, pp. 37–62.
- (763) COLIN H. ROBERTS: *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Manchester. Manchester 1936. Pp. 9–46.
- (764) ALFRED RAHLFS: *Septuaginta-Studien 3: Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher*. Göttingen 1911.
- (765) BRUCE M. METZGER: *Lucian and the Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible*. In: *New Testament Studies* 8, 1961–62, pp. 189–203.
- (766) BRUCE M. METZGER: *The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible*. In his: *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism*. Leiden 1963. Pp. 1–41.

- (767) PAUL E. KAHLE: *The Cairo Geniza*. 2nd ed., Oxford 1959. Trans. into German: *Die Kairoer Geniza. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des hebräischen Bibeltextes und seiner Übersetzungen*. Berlin 1962.
- (768) PETER KATZ: *Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and Its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible*. Cambridge 1950.
- (769) ANDRÉ ROBERT and ALPHONSE E. TRICOT, edd., *Initiation Biblique: Introduction à l'Étude des Saintes Écritures*. 3rd ed., Paris 1959. Trans. into English by EDWARD P. ARBEZ and MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE: *Guide to the Bible*. Paris 1960.
- (770) DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY: *Les Devanciers d'Aquila: première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du dodécaprophète trouvés dans le Désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat Palestinien*. (Supplements to *Vetus Testamentum*, 10). Leiden 1963.
- (771) ROBERT A. KRAFT, rev.: DOMINIQUE BARTHÉLEMY, *Les Devanciers d'Aquila*. In: *Gnomon* 37, 1965, pp. 474–483.
- (772) FRANK M. CROSS: *The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 57, 1964, pp. 281–299.
- (773) FRANK M. CROSS: *The Contribution of the Qumrân Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text*. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 16, 1966, pp. 81–95.
- (774) FRANK M. CROSS: *The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts*. In: ROBERT A. KRAFT, ed., 1972 *Proceedings of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Pseudepigrapha* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 2: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972), pp. 108–126.
- (775) JAMES D. SHENKEL: *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings*. Cambridge, Mass. 1968.
- (776) EUGENE C. ULRICH: *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*. Diss., Ph. D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1975. Published in *Harvard Semitic Monographs*, 19. Missoula, Montana 1978.
- (776a) EUGENE C. ULRICH: *4QSam<sup>a</sup> and Septuagintal Research*. In: *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 8, 1975, pp. 24–39.
- (777) GEORGE HOWARD: *Frank Cross and Recensional Criticism*. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 21, 1971, pp. 440–450.
- (778) GEORGE HOWARD: *Kaige Readings in Josephus*. In: *Textus* 8, 1973, pp. 45–54.
- (779) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: SIDNEY JELLCOE, *The Septuagint and Modern Study*. In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 25, 1971, pp. 57–62.
- (780) DANIEL J. HARRINGTON: *Text and Biblical Text in Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. Diss., Ph. D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1969.
- (781) DANIEL J. HARRINGTON: *The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33, 1971, pp. 1–17.
- (782) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Prolegomenon*. In reissue of: MONTAGUE R. JAMES, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. New York 1971. Pp. vii–clxix.
- (783) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Epilogomenon to Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, 1974, pp. 305–312.
- (783a) GILLIS GERLEMAN: *Studies in the Septuagint*. 3 parts. Lund 1946–56. II. *Chronicles*, Lund 1946 (*Acta Universitatis Lundensis* 1947; n.f., avd. 1, bd. 43, nr. 2–3).
- (783b) SEBASTIAN P. BROCK: *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel*. Diss., D. Phil., Oxford 1966.

Whereas for the Pentateuch Josephus used a Biblical text close, on the whole, to our Masoretic text, with relatively little dependence on the Septuagint, the reverse is true for the books of Samuel (starting with I Samuel 8) through I Maccabees; and Josephus thus becomes a witness of prime importance for the text of the Greek Bible, as THACKERAY (754) correctly notes, though, of course,

some will prefer to say that he continued to use a Hebrew text, but one which diverged widely from the Masorah, or, as THACKERAY (755), p. 81, and JEL-LICOE (756), pp. 286–290, declare – and as seems most likely –, he had before him both a Greek and a Hebrew text. But Josephus' Biblical text for these historical books is not the Septuagint as found in any of the two thousand manuscripts but rather one which is close to that in the minuscule manuscripts  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , the Lucianic text, as MEZ (757) had already concluded. MONTGOMERY (758), pp. 18–19, drew a similar conclusion. Thus Josephus, who lived more than two centuries before Lucian, is already a witness to a text of that type.

A similar text lies behind one of the Old Latin versions (the *Afra*), as well as behind parts of the Peshitta (Syriac) version, as WEVERS (759) has noted. JOHNSON (760) has similarly noted that the *Vorlage* of the second Armenian translation was close to the proto-Lucianic text; and, we may suggest, it would be fruitful to compare the readings in this translation with those of Josephus, Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', the Dead Sea fragments, the Old Latin version, the Peshitta, and the sixth column of Origen's 'Hexapla'.

The fact that we have proto-Lucianic readings not only in Josephus but also in Qumran – and, we may add, in Josephus' first century Palestinian contemporary, the Pseudo-Philonian author of the 'Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum' – is evidence, concludes JEL-LICOE (761), of recensional activity at a center other than Alexandria. He suggests that the Letter of Aristee 30 refers to corrupt Hebrew manuscripts, to counter which the Septuagint was undertaken. JEL-LICOE, though there is no evidence even of an indirect sort in the 'Letter of Aristee', suggests that the center of this recensional activity was Leontopolis, a most unlikely hypothesis in view of the silence about Leontopolis in Philo, who regarded the Septuagint as divinely inspired.

Josephus also, as THACKERAY (754) notes, has occasional parallels in I Samuel with the text of Symmachus and, as MOORE (762) remarks, with Theodotion as well. One possible conclusion is that Josephus influenced the text of Lucian, Symmachus, and Theodotion; but this seems unlikely for Lucian, at any rate, in view of the fact that the Manchester Papyrus Greek 458, as published by ROBERTS (763), shows that a proto-Lucianic type of text was already current in Egypt about 150 B.C.E.

RAHLFS (764) and MOORE (762) challenged THACKERAY's conclusion and argued that the agreements between Lucian and Josephus were minimal; and METZGER (765)(766), agreeing with RAHLFS, argues that particularly in the Book of Samuel some readings which appear in the Lucianic revision were current at a much earlier time. But KAHLE (767), pp. 229–237 (pp. 242–248 in the German translation), effectively refutes this, attributing the consonance between Josephus and Lucian to Christian copyists, to whom KATZ (768) had similarly attributed the agreement between Philo's Biblical text and Aquila. It seems unlikely, as WEVERS (759) has remarked, that the text of Josephus was revised by Christian copyists, since this would have meant a systematic rewriting of Josephus' text, a difficult task to say the least. The discoveries at Qumran, moreover, indicate that just as there are Lucianic readings long before Lucian, so also there are readings reminiscent of Aquila a century before Aquila; hence

KATZ's conclusions regarding Philo's Biblical text must now be reviewed, as ROBERT and TRICOT (769), p. 624, suggest. To say, however, as they do, p. 625, that because Josephus was writing for Greek readers he employed the Septuagint in the text then current and that his Biblical citations present no special problems is to disregard the fact that there were many variant versions already in his day, as can be seen from Philo and the Dead Sea fragments.

A seminal work in the field which already has occasioned a tremendous amount of discussion is that of BARTHÉLEMY (770), who in a brilliant and complete reversal of previous scholarship, argues that the minuscule manuscripts  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ , which has previously been equated with the Lucianic recension, are in reality the old Septuagint in a relatively pure form, while the Codex Vaticanus of the Septuagint and the majority of other witnesses for II Samuel 11.2—I Kings 2.11 and for I Kings 22.1—II Kings 25.30 represent a revision which he calls the *kaige* recension, which is the foundation of Aquila's version (Theodotion, he says, is a predecessor of Aquila), made so as to bring the Greek text into harmony with an early form of the Hebrew text. The leather scroll of the Minor Prophets discovered at Qumran constitutes a link in this recensional chain. Hence Josephus, according to BARTHÉLEMY, pp. 139–140, used the old Septuagint rather than the proto-Lucianic text. The theory is appealing because it explains the 'divergences' of Philo, Josephus, and the Dead Sea fragments from the so-called Septuagint text as not being divergences at all; but, as KRAFT (771) in his review remarks, the identification of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  with the old Septuagint is highly questionable since even in the non-*kaige* sections in most Greek manuscripts there is a characteristic difference between the majority text and  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$ .

CROSS (772), pp. 292–297, (773)(774), analyzing a fragmentary Hebrew text of Samuel dating from the first century B.C.E. found near the Dead Sea, notes a number of proto-Lucianic (or, according to BARTHÉLEMY, Septuagint) readings disagreeing with the Hebrew Masoretic text and the majority of manuscripts of the Septuagint, and even one instance of a reading agreeing with Josephus alone against all other traditions. CROSS concludes that no later than the first century B.C.E. the Septuagint of Samuel and Kings was revised so as to conform to a Hebrew text which we find in the Dead Sea fragments. The result is to be found in Josephus, in Lucian, and in the sixth column of Origen's 'Hexapla'. CROSS refines his thesis, noting that the Palestinian text tradition found in the Dead Sea fragment of Samuel is reflected in Josephus, Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', and the text of the Chronicler. Josephus thus did not 'correct' his Greek Bible with a Hebrew text, since his Hebrew text, as we see from parallels in the Dead Sea fragments, was the one which he reproduces in the 'Antiquities'. CROSS says that we are not yet in a position to answer the question as to whether the proto-Lucianic recension was carried out at one time and place or whether it arose from a tendency to move through various unsystematic corrections toward a Palestinian text. SHENKEL (775) adopts CROSS' view that the Old Greek translation, which is extant in Josephus' Biblical text, was revised toward a developed Palestinian Hebrew type. ULRICH (776) has prepared a dissertation under CROSS comparing Josephus' text with the Greek

recensions of Samuel as well as with the manuscripts from Cave 4 of Qumran. The dissertation attempts to show that Josephus used only a Greek text of the proto-Lucianic type for Samuel, one intimately related to that found at Qumran, and made no use of a Hebrew text; but in view of Josephus' thorough education in the Hebrew text, it seems hard to believe that he would not have consulted the Hebrew text as well. ULRICH's work is of particular value because the Samuel Scrolls from Cave 4 have still not been fully published. ULRICH (776a) summarizes his findings with respect to the relationship of the Qumran text of Samuel and Josephus' Biblical text. The study of the proto-Lucianic text has rightly been termed by WEVERS (759) the most difficult problem in modern work on the Septuagint.

CROSS is subjected to sharp criticism by HOWARD (777), who argues that the text of  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  is itself a mixture of two or more types, and that CROSS has no proof that *kaige* is a revision of proto-Lucian or that proto-Lucian existed before Josephus. HOWARD (778) shows that Josephus in fifteen places agrees with  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  and hence concludes that to call Josephus proto-Lucianic violates the facts and that Josephus relies upon at least two types of the Greek Bible, those of the  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  and the *kaige* recensions. But this, we may reply, presupposes that Josephus had before him a single Hebrew textual tradition. If we postulate that he knew both a Hebrew text and a Greek text, a reasonable enough assumption in view of his undoubted acquaintance with both languages, we may say that his Hebrew text was close to the present Masoretic text, while his Greek text was of a  $\text{boc}_2\text{e}_2$  type; of the sixteen places where, according to HOWARD, Josephus agrees with *kaige*, Josephus agrees with the Masoretic text in thirteen places, and the other cases can be explained by Josephus' paraphrastic style of writing.

JELICOE (756), in an extremely useful handbook examining critically recent scholarship on all major problems connected with the Septuagint, argues that since Josephus shows a considerable degree of independence in his use of known written sources, he probably took similar license in his use of the various Biblical versions as well. As I have remarked in my review (779), however, we must assume that Josephus would not depart from his promise (Ant. 1. 17) neither to add to nor omit from the tradition which he regarded as holy; and his Greek readers were certainly in a position to criticize him if he did.

HARRINGTON (780)(781) notes that Josephus' presumed contemporary, Pseudo-Philo, in his 'Biblical Antiquities', has a Biblical text of the Palestinian type seen in Josephus, in contrast to the Babylonian (Masoretic) text and the Egyptian (Septuagint) text. The Biblical documents from the Dead Sea suggest, according to HARRINGTON's teacher CROSS (772), that an authoritative text of the Hebrew Bible had been promulgated by the second century C.E. and perhaps, in view of the scrolls from Masada, even before 73 (74). Since the 'Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum' used a variant Hebrew text, the author probably, theorizes HARRINGTON, composed his work before 100 and most likely, because of the absence of any clear reference to the fall of Jerusalem, before 70. But the fact, as I (782) have noted, p. clxiv, that Josephus, who completed his 'Antiquities' in 93 C.E. (Ant. 20. 267), has a Biblical text which often disagrees with our Hebrew text and is said to have used a proto-Lucianic text frequently

agreeing with Pseudo-Philo shows that after 70 variant texts had still not been suppressed. Most important of all, however, the Targumic and Midrashic traditions in Palestine, to judge from Biblical variants in the Talmud and Midrashim themselves, continued to permit considerable latitude in quoting, paraphrasing, and expounding the text. In addition, as I (783) have noted, the question of Pseudo-Philo's Biblical text is hardly simple, since all manuscripts of 'Biblical Antiquities' 55.4, as HARRINGTON (780), p. 152, admits, have a reading 'Accaron' agreeing with the Hebrew Masoretic text (I Samuel 5. 10) against the Septuagint, the Lucianic recension, and Josephus (Ant. 6. 4).

GERLEMAN (783a) asserts that the fact that Josephus, as well as Eupolemus, used the Septuagint of Chronicles as a source shows that it must have originated no later than the middle of the second century B.C.E., and that therefore the view that the translation of Chronicles in our manuscripts of the Septuagint emanated from Theodotion must be rejected.

BROCK (783b), pp. 207–221, deals with the relationships among the Lucianic recension, the Peshitta, and Josephus. As to the text used by Josephus in I Samuel, he admits that the evidence is, to some extent, ambiguous but, on the whole, sides with RAHLFS and criticizes MEZ and THACKERAY as vastly exaggerating the 'Ur-Lucianic' character of Josephus' Septuagint text. He argues that of the thirty instances which MEZ has adduced in support of his theory, only nine are valid. BROCK, in turn, cites five instances where Josephus follows the Hebrew text against the Septuagint, whereas he notes twelve cases where he follows the Septuagint against the Masoretic text. As to places where Josephus agrees with Lucian against the Septuagint, his additions may often be explained as due to his attempt to make better sense. BROCK concludes that Josephus merely confirms the impression gained elsewhere that the Lucianic recension here and there has preserved old material lost to the rest of the surviving tradition.

#### 10.14: Josephus on Specific Passages in Samuel and Kings

- (783c) SEBASTIAN BROCK: A Doublet and Its Ramifications. In: *Biblica* 56, 1975, pp. 550–553.
- (784) R. THORNHILL: A Note on 'l-nkwn, 1 Sam. XXVI.4. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 14, 1964, pp. 462–466.
- (785) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY and (from 6. 141) RALPH MARCUS, edd. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 5, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books V–VIII (Loeb Classical Library). London 1934.
- (786) IMRE TRENCSENYI-WALDAPFEL: Die Hexe von Endor und die griechisch-römische Welt. In: *Acta Orientalia* 12, 1961, pp. 201–222.
- (787) KLAUS BERGER: Materialien zu Form und Überlieferungsgeschichte neutestamentlicher Gleichnisse. In: *Novum Testamentum* 15, 1973, pp. 1–37.
- (787a) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Josephus as an Apologist of the Greco-Roman World: His Portrait of Solomon. In: ELISABETH S. FIORENZA, ed., *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Notre Dame 1976. Pp. 69–98.
- (788) FREDERICK C. CONYBEARE: The Testament of Solomon. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* (old series) 11, 1898–99, pp. 1–45.



- (789) M. B. ROWTON: The Date of the Founding of Solomon's Temple. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 119, 1950, pp. 20–23.
- (790) JACOB LIVER: The Chronology of Tyre at the Beginning of the First Millennium B.C. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 3, 1953, pp. 113–120.
- (791) HANS JACOB KATZENSTEIN: The History of Tyre. Diss., Ph. D., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1965. Publ. (first eight chapters, rev.) as: *The History of Tyre from the Beginning of the Second Millennium B.C.E. until the Fall of the Neo-Babylonian Empire in 538 B.C.E.* Jerusalem 1973.
- (792) HANS J. KATZENSTEIN: Is There Any Synchronism between the Reigns of Hiram and Solomon? In: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 24, 1965, pp. 116–117.
- (793) JOAQUIN M. PEÑUELA: La inscripción asiria IM 55644 y la cronología de los reyes de Tiro. In: *Sefarad* 13, 1953, pp. 217–237; 14, 1954, pp. 3–42.
- (794) EDWIN R. THIELE: A Comparison of the Chronological Data of Israel and Judah. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 4, 1954, pp. 185–195.
- (795) PIERRE CINTAS: Laurentianus LXIX. 22 ou la torture d'un texte. In: *Mélanges André Piganiol*. Vol. 3. Paris 1966. Pp. 1681–1692.
- (796) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums, 5). Leiden 1972.
- (797) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 1, *The Life; Against Apion* (Loeb Classical Library). London 1926.
- (798) JULIEN WEILL, trans.: Œuvres complètes de Flavius Josèphe traduites en français sous la direction de THÉODORE REINACH. Vol. 2: *Antiquités judaïques. Livres VI–X.* Paris 1926.
- (799) BENJAMIN UFFENHEIMER: The 'Awakeners' – A Cultic Term from the Ancient Near East (in Hebrew). In: *Leshonenu* 30, 1965, pp. 163–174.
- (800) JULIAN MORGENSTERN: The King-G-d among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 10, 1960, pp. 138–197.
- (801) EDWARD ULLENDORFF: The Queen of Sheba. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 45, 1962–63, pp. 486–504.
- (802) EDWARD ULLENDORFF: *Ethiopia and the Bible*. London 1968.
- (803) WILLIAM F. ALBRIGHT: The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 100, 1945, pp. 16–22.
- (804) EDWIN R. THIELE: *The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings*. Chicago 1951; rev. ed., Grand Rapids 1965.
- (805) ISIDORE LÉVY: Deux noms phéniciens altérés chez Josèphe. In: *Mélanges Syriens offerts à René Dussaud*. Vol. 2. Paris 1939. Pp. 539–545.
- (806) OTTO MICHEL, OTTO BAUERNEFEIND, and OTTO BETZ: Der Tempel der goldenen Kuh: Bemerkungen zur Polemik im Spätjudentum. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49, 1958, pp. 197–212. Rpt. in: *Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag*. Berlin 1958. Pp. 56–67.
- (807) KURT SCHUBERT: Die jüdischen und judenchristlichen Sekten im Lichte des Handschriftenfundes von 'En Fešcha. In: *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 74, 1952, pp. 1–62.
- (808) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Medieval Mind and the Theological Speculation on the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49, 1958–59, pp. 1–34.
- (809) EDUARD SCHWARTZ: BEROSSOS. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 3. 1, 1897, cols. 309–316.
- (810) MAX VOGELSTEIN: *Biblical Chronology, Part 1*. Cincinnati 1944.
- (811) DONALD J. WISEMAN: *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings (626–556 B.C.) in the British Museum*. London 1956.
- (812) DAVID N. FREEDMAN: The Babylonian Chronicle. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 19, 1956, pp. 50–60.

- (813) JAMES PHILIP HYATT: New Light on Nebuchadrezzar and Judean History. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75, 1956, pp. 277–284.
- (814) ABRAHAM MALAMAT: A New Record of Nebuchadrezzar's Palestinian Campaigns (in Hebrew). In: *Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society* 20, 1956, pp. 179–187. Trans. into English in: *Israel Exploration Journal* 6, 1956, pp. 246–256.
- (815) HAYIM TADMOR: Chronology of the Last Kings of Judah. In: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 15, 1956, pp. 226–230.
- (816) CHARLES L. WOOLLEY: *Carchemish*. Vol. 2. London 1921.
- (817) E. VOGT: Die neubabylonische Chronik über die Schlacht bei Karkemisch und die Einnahme von Jerusalem. In: *Vetus Testamentum, Supplementum* 4, 1957, pp. 67–96.
- (818) KURT GALLING: *Studien zur Geschichte Israels im persischen Zeitalter*. Tübingen 1964.
- (819) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (820) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Berossus. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica Yearbook* 1973, Jerusalem 1973, p. 177.
- (820a) LOREN R. FISHER: 'Can This Be the Son of David?' In: F. THOMAS TROTTER, ed., *Jesus and the Historian. Written in Honor of Ernest C. Colwell*. Philadelphia 1968. Pp. 82–97.
- (820b) ERIK HORNING: Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte des Neuen Reiches (Ägyptologische Abhandlungen, edd. WOLFGANG HELCK and EBERHARD OTTO, Bd. 11). Wiesbaden 1964.
- (820c) WILLIAM F. ALBRIGHT: The New Assyro-Tyrian Synchronism and the Chronology of Tyre. In: *Mélanges Isidore Lévy. Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*. Brussels 1955. Pp. 1–9.
- (820d) EDUARD LIPIŃSKI: Ba'li-Ma'zer II and the Chronology of Tyre. In: *Revista degli Studi Orientali* 45, 1970, pp. 59–65.
- (820e) FUAD SAFAR: A Further Text of Salsmaneser III from Assur. In: *Sumer* 7, 1951, pp. 3–21.
- (820f) DENNIS C. DULING: Solomon, Exorcism, and the Son of David. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 68, 1975, pp. 235–252.
- (820g) HARRY E. FABER VAN DER MEULEN: *Das Salomo-Bild im hellenistisch-jüdischen Schrifttum*. Diss., Kampen 1978.
- (820h) RENÉ REBUFFAT: Une bataille navale au VIII<sup>e</sup> siècle (Josèphe, *Antiquités Judaïques*, IX, 14). In: *Semitica* 26, 1976, pp. 71–79.
- (820i) SAMUEL KRAUSS: Die Namen der Königin von Saba. In: *Festschrift Dr. Jakob Freimann zum 70. Geburtstag*. Berlin 1937. Pp. 119–124.
- (820j) JOSEPH A. FITZMYER and DANIEL J. HARRINGTON: *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (Second Century B.C.–Second Century A.D.)* (*Biblica et Orientalia*, 34). Rome 1978.

BROCK (783c) notes that the manuscript tradition of the Septuagint of I Samuel 23.1 shows a double translation of the Hebrew *shosim* and that Josephus (Ant. 6. 271) supplies a *terminus ante quem* for this 'correction'. We may, however, comment that Josephus is perhaps translating (or paraphrasing) directly from the Hebrew, since his version is indeed closer to the Hebrew. BROCK's proof that Josephus is basing himself on the Greek translation rather than on the Hebrew is his version (Ant. 6. 192) of I Samuel 17. 53, since ἐν-έπρησε, he says, must be based on the original Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew *midelok*, whereas in all the Greek manuscripts of the Septuagint it has been corrupted into ἐκκλίνοντες. Here, too, we may suggest, a simpler explanation is that Josephus was translating from the Hebrew directly. We may con-

clude that Josephus, since he was writing in Greek, found it easier to use the Septuagint as the major source of the language of his paraphrase, except where, upon comparison with the original, which, in view of his education, he surely knew well, he felt that it required correction or amplification.

THORNHILL (784), on the basis of Josephus, *Antiquities* 6. 310, which says that Saul encamped at Sikella, emends the Hebrew of I Samuel 26. 4 from *'el-nakhon* ("of a certainty") to *'el ha-(ha)khilah* (to Hachilah). But, we may remark, aside from the fact that the emendation is rather far from the Hebrew manuscripts it is really unnecessary, since in I Samuel 26. 1 and 3 the Bible identifies the site as Hachilah, and Josephus' Σικέλλα (variant Σεκέλλα, Σεκελλά, Σεκελλά) is closer to the Septuagint's Κεειλλά or even to the reading of Lucian, Σεκελλάγ, as MARCUS (785), note on 6. 310, remarks.

TRENCSENYI-WALDAPFEL (786) comments on Josephus' adoption (*Ant.* 6. 327) of the Septuagint's translation of ἐγγαστριμυθος ("ventriloquist") for the Hebrew *'ōb* (I Samuel 28. 3), on Josephus' lack of sympathy with Saul's ban on these diviners, and on Josephus' excursus of praise of the Witch of Endor (*Ant.* 6. 340–342). We may add that Josephus elsewhere also shows sympathetic interest in the occult, e.g. *Antiquities* 8. 46–49, where he tells how a certain Eleazar, using a ring which had one of the roots prescribed by Solomon and reciting incantations composed by that king, was able to exorcise demons. Such a belief, despite the apparently clear injunctions against the occult in the Pentateuch (Deut. 18. 10–11), was widespread, as the Talmud clearly shows.

BERGER (787), pp. 12–13, comparing Josephus' version (*Ant.* 7. 148–149) of Nathan's parable with that in the Septuagint, in the Testament of Solomon D and E, in the Palaia, and in the Koran, notes that Josephus presents Nathan as a cultured man who understands how to speak what is necessary in a wise and diplomatic fashion.

I (787a) have commented on the considerable changes made by Josephus in his account of Solomon for apologetic reasons. In particular, I suggest that he modelled Solomon's character on that of Oedipus as one who showed his wisdom when all others had been mentally blinded as by a riddle, and that he touched up his portrait with Stoic overtones.

With regard to the incantations of Solomon, we may note CONYBEARE'S (788) suggestion that the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs in its original form may be the very collection of incantations which, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 8. 45), had been composed by Solomon; but there is no evidence to support this conjecture.

One of the interesting points in connection with Josephus' discussion of Solomon's reign is Josephus' use of non-Biblical sources. ROWTON (789) notes that Josephus interrupts his quotation of Menander of Ephesus (*Against Apion* 1. 117–120) with regard to Hiram king of Tyre just at the point when one would expect a statement about the Temple. Josephus, he suggests, omitted this part of the narrative because it would have been embarrassing to present the Tyrian version, which presumably noted the amount of help that Solomon had received and the value of the territory ceded by Solomon to Tyre. But Josephus is not embarrassed, we may reply, to remark that Abdemun, a Tyrian lad, always bested

Solomon in solving problems (Against Apion 1. 120); and in the interest of getting external evidence to support the Biblical account Josephus might well have been ready to cite such details as well. In any case, he does cite (Against Apion 1. 110) the fact that Solomon gave Hiram a district in Galilee as a gift.

There is a troublesome contradiction in Josephus between *Antiquities* 8. 62, which says that Solomon began to build the Temple in the eleventh year of Hiram's reign, whereas in *Against Apion* 1. 126 he says that the Temple was built in the twelfth year of Hiram's reign. The distinction is not between the beginning and end of the building of the Temple, since the work took seven years (*Ant.* 8. 99).

LIVER (790), p. 115, note 6, suggests that the figure twelve is a round number and hence doubtful.

KATZENSTEIN (791), pp. 61–62 (printed version), commenting on the date of the re-foundation of Tyre (*Ant.* 8. 62) in the light of Justin and of archaeological finds, concludes that this may be a fiction of Josephus. For Nebuchadnezzar and the neo-Babylonian period (*Ant.* 10. 181–182), KATZENSTEIN, pp. 334 ff., decides that Josephus' account is based on real events, even if they are represented against a misleading background. In general, however, he concludes that Josephus' writings deserve much greater attention, even beyond that which has been given them.

Developing at some length the question of Josephus' chronology for the Tyrian kings, KATZENSTEIN says in a separate article (792) that the discrepancy is due to an error in Josephus, who incorrectly copied the number from his source. He says that Josephus may have found in his source that in the eleventh and twelfth years of Hiram's reign Hiram built temples to Heracles and Astarte in Tyre (*Ant.* 8. 146, *Against Apion* 1. 119) and that he applied these numbers to the date of the building of the Temple in Jerusalem. Another possibility suggested by KATZENSTEIN is that Josephus found in the Bible (I Kings 6. 38) that Solomon had finished the Temple in the eleventh year of his reign and that he dedicated it in the twelfth year, and that he then transferred these years to Hiram. But such transpositions would be blatant errors that Josephus could hardly have risked lest he be caught. Besides, as a priest of the leading rank, he certainly knew the traditions with regard to the building of the Temple. It is clear from the fact that in *Against Apion* 1. 117–120 Josephus quotes precisely the same passage from Menander that he quotes in *Antiquities* 8. 144–146 that he had Menander before him in writing both accounts; and the simplest explanation would seem to be to ascribe the discrepancy to a scribal error.

PENUELA (793) corrects the chronology of the kings of Tyre in *Against Apion* 1. 117–126, where Josephus quotes Menander, on the basis of a cuneiform inscription.

THIELE (794) contends, on the basis of a correlation with Babylonian and Assyrian chronology, that Josephus' data (*Against Apion* 1. 108, 1. 126; *Antiquities* 8. 62) for the Tyrian and Hebrew kings are unreliable. In particular, he cites the recent text of Belezoros of Tyre which upsets Josephus' chronology. But, we may comment, this impugns Josephus' source, which he declares to be Menander, who obtained his information allegedly from the Tyrian archives.

CINTAS (795) notes that for *Against Apion* 1. 117–126, where Josephus quotes Menander on the kings of Tyre, all the manuscripts, as well as the *editio princeps*, go back to the Laurentianus 69. 22. But the last student of the manuscript tradition, SCHRECKENBERG (796), pp. 19–20, notes that this manuscript is often inferior to the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, the Latin translation, and Eusebius, though NIESE appears to have gone too far in his negative opinion of this manuscript.

Josephus, quoting Menander (*Against Apion* 1. 119, *Antiquities* 8. 146), speaks of Hiram as building shrines to Heracles and Astarte, and remarks that he made the ἑγερσις of Heracles first. The Loeb Library itself is split in its interpretation of this word. THACKERAY (797), on *Against Apion* 1. 119, following HUDSON and WHISTON, and, more recently, KATZENSTEIN (791) understand it to refer to the building of the temple to Heracles, whereas MARCUS (785), following WEILL (798), translates: "He was the first to celebrate the awakening of Heracles". The etymological and the applied meaning of the word ἑγερσις is 'awakening', and the only passage where it definitely has another meaning is in Herodianus (8. 5. 4), who speaks, quite literally, of the raising of walls. Our passage, which speaks of the ἑγερσις of Heracles, can have no such meaning. UFFENHEIMER (799), furthermore, presents conclusive evidence that the awakening of Ba'al, who was identified by the Greeks with Heracles, as we see in Elijah's derisive comment in I Kings 18. 27 or in an Aramaic inscription, marked the climax of his annual feast.

MORGENSTERN (800), who adopts this interpretation of ἑγερσις, suggests, though without evidence, that Hiram himself enacted the role of the resurrected sun-god and thus became a divine being, Epiphanes. MORGENSTERN also interprets Josephus' remark (*Ant.* 9. 225) that a bright shaft of sunlight fell upon King Uziah's face and that he was afflicted with leprosy as indicating that the Hebrew equivalent of the sun-god found Uziah unqualified for becoming a divinity. Josephus, he says, had access to some extra-Biblical source on this matter. But the bright shaft of sunlight is simply the imagery inherent in the Biblical Hebrew (II Chronicles 26. 19), we may reply. There is no hint of apotheosis or of a frustrated apotheosis in Josephus; and the proof from comparative mythology which MORGENSTERN attempts is hazardous.

ULLENDORFF (801) (802), p. 135, remarks that Josephus' account of Solomon's meeting with the Queen of Sheba (*Ant.* 8. 165–175) is "somewhat smartened up" but essentially faithful to the Biblical account and is entirely innocent of the accretions which later became attached to this event. ULLENDORFF does not fully appreciate the net effect of Josephus' changes, namely to magnify Solomon's wisdom considerably, particularly his speed in solving ingenious problems by minimizing the magical element so prominent in the Midrashic accounts.

ALBRIGHT (803) discusses the chronology of the divided monarchy on the basis of Assyrian, Babylonian, and Accadian evidence but neglects the important evidence of Josephus, *Antiquities* 8. 219–10. 148.

THIELE (804), pp. 204–227 (first edition), asks whether the figures in Josephus with regard to the length of the reigns of the kings of Judah and of Israel

which are at variance both with the Hebrew text and with the Septuagint may not represent the original dates of the Hebrew kings more correctly than those in the Masoretic text. Josephus' figures fit a pattern and are, with the exception of the data about Jehoahaz, not the result of scribal errors. In no case, concludes THIELE, are Josephus' variations an improvement over the Masoretic text, as we see from Josephus' systematic divergence from the established chronology of the Near East. In his revised edition, pp. 198–200, he recognizes, however, that these variant figures may have been present in the Hebrew text which the Greek translators had before them.

LÉVY (805) identifies the town of Arkē (Ant. 5. 85ff. and 9. 285) with Akē (Ant. 8. 37) and says that the Assyrian king Elulaiosor Pyas (Ant. 9. 284) is really Lylas. LÉVY cites a number of parallels in Josephus for the use of double names for a person; but there is, we may comment, a distinction between double names and alternate scribal spellings.

MICHEL—BAUERNFEIND—BETZ (806), commenting on War 4. 3 and Antiquities 8. 226, discuss the cult of the two golden calves erected by King Jeroboam at Dan in the Hebrew Bible (I Kings 12. 29) and in the Septuagint, and the polemic against this worship in the Qumran scrolls.

SCHUBERT (807) suggests that Josephus, Antiquities 10. 38, derives his information that Isaiah was put to death by Manasseh from the Essenes. ZEITLIN (808) disputes this contention, noting that Josephus does not specify that Isaiah was put to death. But, we may note, Josephus does say that Manasseh slaughtered some of the prophets daily, an addition that is not found in Scripture (II Kings 21. 16). Still, in view of the many other places where Josephus parallels rabbinic and pseudepigraphic tradition, it is more likely that Josephus derived the tradition of the death of the prophets at the hands of Manasseh from such traditions (cf. Babylonian Talmud: Yevamoth 49b, Sanhedrin 103b; Jerusalem Talmud: Sanhedrin 10. 2, 28c; Pseudepigrapha: Martyrdom of Isaiah; New Testament: Hebrews 11. 37) rather than from the Essenes.

One of the important questions with regard to Josephus' account of the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar is the extent to which Josephus employed the Babylonian historian Berossus (third century B.C.E.) as a source. SCHWARTZ (809) concluded that Josephus knew him through Alexander Polyhistor (first century B.C.E.) or King Juba of Mauretania (first century B.C.E.), though he does cite him by name, we may note, on seven occasions (Ant. 1. 93, 1. 107, 1. 158, 10. 20, 10. 34, 10. 219–226; Against Apion 1. 129–153), the last at great length. Apparently Berossus mentioned the fall of Jerusalem only in passing (Against Apion 1. 135–136).

VOGELSTEIN (810) presents a detailed analysis of Berossus' report as cited in Josephus (Against Apion 1. 135ff., Ant. 10. 220ff.) and concludes that Josephus is exceedingly well informed. He concludes that Antiquities 10. 108ff. fully confirms the punitive action taken by Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem in 589/588 in King Zedekiah's eighth year. He notes that the Hibeh Papyrus 9 confirms Josephus' version of an Egyptian expedition which forced Nebuchadnezzar to lift the siege of Jerusalem.

WISEMAN (811) has published an important new chronicle which strikingly confirms the account of Berossus as reported in Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 135 and *Antiquities* 10. 219ff., of the Battle of Carchemish, though it does show a number of differences with the account (*Ant.* 10. 96–102) of the events leading up to the fall of Jerusalem and the capture of King Jehoiachin.

FREEDMAN (812) comments on the significance of WISEMAN's publication and notes that this text now confirms two important dates – the battle of Carchemish (605 B.C.E.), in which the Babylonians defeated the Egyptians, and the first conquest of Jerusalem (597 B.C.E.).

HYATT (813) similarly notes that WISEMAN's documents confirm the account in *Jeremiah* 46. 2 and Josephus' version, and states that the excavation of Carchemish indeed confirms that the city was taken about 600 B.C.E.

MALAMAT (814) notes that the Babylonian Chronicle supplements Josephus' account by filling in the precise chronological details of Nebuchadnezzar's campaign.

TADMOR (815) remarks how closely the chronicle accords with both Josephus and the archaeological data, as described by WOOLLEY (816), pp. 125–126.

Another appreciation of the importance of WISEMAN's (811) work is by VOGT (817).

GALLING (818), pp. 29–32, comments on the force of the participle προεξεληλυθώς in the fragment of Berossus quoted in *Against Apion* 1. 150. He favors the omission of καί, as in Eusebius, in the next clause. He also discusses the meaning of πᾶσαν in τὴν λοιπὴν Ἀσίαν πᾶσαν.

SCHALIT (819), pp. 258, concludes that the remarkable accuracy of Josephus' account of the Battle of Carchemish can be explained only if we assume that he derived it directly from Berossus; but it is, we may here suggest, perfectly possible to copy accurately from a reliable secondary source, though, as I (820) have concluded, in all probability, Josephus used Berossus directly, as his numerous citations of that author seem to indicate. The fact, however, as I note, that on two occasions (*Ant.* 10. 219–228, *Against Apion* 1. 134–144) Josephus cites the same passage on Nebuchadnezzar from Berossus, together with precisely the same confirmatory references from Philostratus and Megasthenes would indicate that at least here he was using a handbook.

FISHER (820a), p. 85, notes that Josephus' reference (*Ant.* 8. 47) to Solomon's ring is confirmed by the 'Sefer ha-Razim', which similarly alludes to Solomon's importance in magical texts.

HORNUNG (820b), p. 28, on the basis of ROWTON (789) and ALBRIGHT (820c), synchronizes the fourth year of Solomon's reign with the twelfth year of Hiram's reign as 959 B.C.E., since Josephus says that the Temple was built 145 years before the founding of Carthage (814 B.C.E.).

LIPÍŃSKI (820d) comments on a marble slab dated 838 B.C.E. from Assur published by SAFAR (820e) which refers to tribute paid by Ba'-a-li-ma-an-zer the Tyrian, whom Lipiński identifies with the contemporary king Balezoros mentioned by Josephus (*Against Apion* 1. 117–125 and *Ant.* 8. 144–146). On this basis he concludes that the reading of the Codex Laurentianus, Βαδέζωρος,

goes back to Βαλέζωρος. He notes that Josephus (Against Apion 1. 126) gives the period from Hiram to the foundation of Carthage as 155 years and eight months. If we assume that Josephus confused the years of Hiram's reign with the years of his life and if we include the fifty-three years of Hiram's life instead of his thirty-four regnal years, we reach exactly 155 years and eight months.

DULING (820f) traces the portrayal of Solomon the exorcist from the Bible through intertestamental references to Talmudic evidence and incantation bowls and early Christian tradition. Josephus' innovations are his statements that Solomon wrote thousands of books, including books of incantations, that Solomon possessed more than knowledge of plants or even powers of roots, and that the exorcist Eleazar repeated Solomon's name and recited his incantations. He concludes that the picture of Solomon as exorcist may have had an effect upon Christian tradition.

FABER VAN DER MEULEN (820g) analyzes the portrait of Solomon in Josephus as compared with other Hellenistic Jewish and Midrashic sources. He concludes that Josephus used a Greek translation which was close to the Masoretic Text, though perhaps Josephus employed more than one Greek translation, checking them against the Hebrew text. Josephus' Solomon is the typical righteous ruler who at the end changed into a *tyrannos* under the pernicious influence of his foreign wives.

REBUFFAT (820h) notes that Josephus (Ant. 9. 285–286) cites Menander of Ephesus' statement that sixty Phoenician ships manned by eight hundred oarsmen were defeated by twelve Tyrian ships. REBUFFAT corrects Josephus, suggesting that since 800 is not divisible by 60, there were actually sixteen Phoenician ships, each with fifty oarsmen, and that the Phoenician ships must have been destroyed or broken up, since there were prisoners.

KRAUSS (820i) notes that Josephus (Ant. 8. 158) gives the name of the Queen of Sheba as Nikaule and adds the extra-Biblical detail that she was queen of Egypt and Ethiopia. He sees in this detail in Josephus a special tradition in common with the rabbis, except that the rabbis had no opportunity to mention her name. We may comment that the fact that her name is mentioned in the rabbinic Targum Sheni (probably to be dated at the end of the seventh or at the beginning of the eighth century, a view strengthened by its relationship to the Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer) to Esther 1. 3 as Nikaulin, as well as by Eldad Hadani (late ninth century), whose source, to be sure, may have been the tradition of the Jewish Falashas of Ethiopia, indicates that there probably was a rabbinic tradition as to her name.

FITZMYER and HARRINGTON (820j), p. 223, comments on the Uzziah Tomb Slab with reference to Antiquities 9. 227, which refers to the burial of King Uzziah of Judah, who was a leper.

### 10.15: Daniel

- (821) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: Josephus and Daniel. In: Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 4, 1965, pp. 148–162.



- (822) JAY BRAVERMAN: Jerome as a Biblical Exegete in Relation to Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition as Seen in His *Commentary on Daniel*. Diss., Ph. D., Yeshiva University, New York 1970. Published as: *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 7). Washington 1978.
- (823) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 6, Jewish Antiquities, Books IX–XI (Loeb Classical Library). London 1937.
- (824) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (The Anchor Bible, 41). Garden City, New York 1976.
- (824a) GERHARD DAUTZENBERG: Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der δι᾿ ἀκριβοῦς πνευμάτων (1 Kor 12, 10). In: *Biblische Zeitschrift* 15, 1971, pp. 93–104.
- (824b) DAVID FLUSSER: The Four Empires in the Fourth Sybil and in the Book of Daniel. In: *Israel Oriental Series* 2, 1972, pp. 148–175.
- (824c) ANDRÉ PAUL: Le concept de prophétie biblique. Flavius Josèphe et Daniel. In: *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 63, 1975, pp. 367–384.
- (824d) LOUIS F. HARTMAN and ALEXANDER A. DI LELLA, edd.: The Book of Daniel (The Anchor Bible, 23). Garden City, New York 1978.
- (824e) LESTER L. GRABBE: Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography. In: PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, vol. 2. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 43–68.
- (824f) GOHEI HATA: The *Jewish War* of Josephus: A Semantic and Historiographic Study. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1975.
- (824g) P. M. CASEY: The Interpretation of Daniel VII in Jewish and Patristic Literature and in the New Testament: An Approach to the Son of Man Problem. Diss., University of Durham, England 1976.
- (824h) LARS HARTMANN: The Functions of Some So-Called Apocalyptic Timetables. In: *New Testament Studies* 22, 1976, pp. 1–14.
- (824i) ANDRÉ LACOCQUE: Le Livre de Daniel (Commentaire de l'Ancient Testament, 15a). Paris 1976. Trans. into English by DAVID PELLAUER and revised by the author: The Book of Daniel. Atlanta and London 1979.

BRUCE (821) concludes that Josephus' version of Daniel is based almost entirely on the contents of the canonical Hebrew-Aramaic text of Daniel and that he did not know the Septuagint additions at all, his changes being due to some other source. Josephus' chronology for the period of the Second Temple is consistently too long by approximately fifty years because of his interpretation of Daniel 9.24–27. BRUCE also traces the oracle of War 6.311–313 back to Josephus' interpretation of Daniel 9.25–26.

BRAVERMAN (822), pp. 251–253 (132–136 in the printed version), in a most interesting and suggestive doctoral dissertation, discusses sixteen passages in Jerome's commentary on Daniel where he refers explicitly to Jewish (presumably rabbinic) traditions, only four of which have definite parallels in extant rabbinic literature. Of these four, two – the tradition that Daniel and the three boys were eunuchs (Daniel 1.3; cf. Ant. 10.186–187) and the role of Noah as a preacher prior to the Flood (Daniel 9.2; cf. Ant. 1.74) – are found also in Josephus. Of the remaining traditions, six are in part available to us in rabbinic tradition. The other six are to be found neither in Josephus nor in rabbinic traditions.

BRAVERMAN notes that *Antiquities* 10. 195, a passage cited by Jerome, explains, in an extra-Biblical addition, the apparent contradiction between the fact that Nebuchadnezzar's dream occurred (Daniel 2. 1) in the second year of his reign, whereas Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah did not enter his presence until after three years (Daniel 1. 5, 1. 18). Josephus' explanation is that Daniel 2. 1 refers to a period of two years after the sacking of Egypt. The Talmudic tradition (*Seder Olam Rabbah* 28), bothered by the same problem, says that the reference is to two years after the destruction of the Temple. But Jerome specifically says that "the Hebrews", his usual way of referring to Rabbinic tradition, solve the difficulty by asserting that the reference is to the second year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign over all the barbarian nations and then proceeds to cite Josephus as specifically corroborating the Hebrew tradition. One may conclude, therefore, that in the midrashim available to Jerome but which are now lost, there was a view similar to that expressed by Josephus.

BRAVERMAN, pp. 220–223 (109–112 in the printed version), comments on Josephus' omission of any direct reference to the prophecy in Daniel 9. He suggests that Josephus is deliberately ambiguous in *Antiquities* 10. 276, where he says that "Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans and that it [ambiguous] would be desolated by them [ambiguous]". (The remainder, "and the Temple laid waste," is an addition from the excerpt in Chrysostom). Josephus, he concludes with good reason, could not have afforded to be more explicit because of his Roman patrons. Similarly, as BRAVERMAN notes, Josephus (*Ant.* 10. 210), in his comment on the stone in Daniel 2. 34–35, 45, says that he does not think it proper to explain its meaning, "since I am expected to write of what is past and done and not of what is to be". He suggests that the reader who desires more exact information should turn to the Book of Daniel itself. We may add that similarly Josephus tones down potentially anti-Roman material in his treatment of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Daniel 2. 44; cf. *Ant.* 10. 203 ff.); and in *Antiquities* 4. 125, in his account of Balaam's prophecies, he speaks in the vaguest terms of the calamities that will befall cities of the highest celebrity, some of which had not yet been founded, and amongst which his Jewish readers might well have recognized a reference to Rome. The reason for Josephus' evasiveness, as MARCUS (823), on *Antiquities* 10. 210, writes, is that the stone was regarded in current Jewish exegesis as a symbol of the Messiah who would put an end to the Roman Empire.

GOLDSTEIN (824), pp. 558–568, concludes that for his account of Daniel Josephus had basically the same text as that in our Hebrew Bible but that he presented his material in the form of a synthesized oracle in order to impress his Greek and Roman audience better. GOLDSTEIN concludes that Josephus' departures (*Ant.* 12. 246–256) from I Maccabees 1. 20–64 may be accounted for by his belief in the veracity of Daniel 7–12, as well by his belief in the value and efficacy of martyrdom and his intention to write his work in good Greek rhetorical style.

DAUTZENBERG (824a) comments on the choice of words for interpretation of dreams employed in the Septuagint, Philo, Josephus (in his account of Daniel, *Ant.* 10. 246, 267), the New Testament, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. He

concludes that the references in Josephus lead to the conclusion that the interpretation of oracles, signs, and dreams constitutes a definite element in the life of Palestinian Judaism of the New Testament period.

FLUSSER (824b) notes that Josephus (*Ant.* 10. 276–277) could not speak of the common interpretation of the four empires in Daniel because of its anti-Roman character, but that in *Antiquities* 15. 385–387, where no danger could arise, he has given the common Jewish sequence of the four empires – Babylonia, Persia, Macedonia, and Rome.

PAUL (824c) presents a detailed exposition of Josephus' treatment of Daniel (*Ant.* 10. 266–281), concluding that Josephus' version is virtually in itself prophetic because it was historical and is Biblical because it was readable. The episode highlights the chief historical question that faced Josephus in his own day, how to be the authentic representative of a defeated Jewish nation. Thus his treatment of Daniel encapsules the theory validating the entire work.

HARTMAN and DI LELLA (824d), p. 24, note parallels between Josephus and rabbinic literature on the motif of the lions that did not touch Daniel. They also comment on the parallel between Nebuchadnezzar becoming the servant of G-d and Alexander greeting the high priest reverently (*Ant.* 11. 329–339). They use Josephus to set the background for Daniel 7–12, which they declare reflects the period of Antiochus Epiphanes' vicious persecution of the Jews. They comment (p. 291) that "the violent men of your own people [who] will lift themselves up" (Daniel 11. 14) belongs most likely to a Jewish pro-Seleucid party eager to overthrow Egyptian sovereignty in Palestine (*Ant.* 12. 129–153). Finally, they use Josephus (*Ant.* 12. 293–297) to identify the background of Daniel 11. 23–24, namely Antiochus' treacherous rule.

GRABBE (824e) is largely dependent upon BRUCE (821) in his interpretation of Josephus' version of the seventy-weeks prophecy of Daniel 9. 24–27.

HATA (824f) notes that many scholars have ascribed Josephus' evasiveness (*Ant.* 10. 203–210) as to the meaning of the stone in Daniel 2. 31–45 to its reinterpretation as the Messiah. He suggests that Josephus also knew other interpretations in Rome. We may, however, comment that the Messianic interpretation of this passage was the most widely current in Josephus' time, and that he, as a lackey of Rome, did not want to offend the Romans by giving it.

I have not seen CASEY (824g), pp. 418–422, who comments on Josephus' version of Daniel (*Ant.* 10. 188–281).

HARTMANN (824h), pp. 6–7 and 13–14, comments on Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 10. 267) that Daniel fixed the time at which certain prophecies would come to pass and the relation of this to the prophecy (*War* 6. 312–313) that someone from Judaea would become ruler of the world.

LACOCQUE (824i) frequently cites Josephus in his commentary on Daniel.

## 10.16: The Prophetic Books

- (825) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.

- (826) SOFIA CAVALLETTI: *La spada sul cielo*. In: *Antonionum* 30, 1955, pp. 185–187.
- (827) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Two Traditions concerning the Time of Isaiah's Prophecy on the Destruction of the Temple and the Return to Zion (in Hebrew). In: SALO W. BARON, BENZION DINUR, SAMUEL ETTINGER, and ISRAEL HALPERN, edd., *Yitzhak Baer Jubilee Vol.*, Jerusalem 1960. Pp. 69–74.
- (828) MOSHE GREENBERG: On Ezekiel's Dumbness. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77, 1958. pp. 101–105.
- (828a) ODIL H. STECK: Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum. Neukirchen–Vluyn 1967.
- (828b) J. ALBERTO SOGGIN: Das Erdbeben von Amos 1. 1 und die Chronologie der Könige Ussia und Jotham von Juda. In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 82, 1970, pp. 117–121.
- (828c) YVES-MARIE DUVAL: *Le livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine; sources et influence du Commentaire sur Jonas de saint Jérôme*. 2 vols. Paris 1973.
- (828d) CHRISTIAN WOLFF: *Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum*. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Bd. 118). Berlin 1976. (Revision of the author's thesis: *Jeremia in Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Greifswald 1971).

It seems strange that there should not be a single direct reference to the prophetic books in the 'Antiquities'. SCHALIT (825), p. 258, suggests that this omission is due to the fact that Josephus wrote for a non-Jewish audience to whom the figure of Moses was familiar, while the prophets were, it seems, unknown to the enlightened Hellenistic world. This, we may add, may explain why Philo similarly almost totally ignores the prophets, though they contain so much that would buttress Philo's ethical teachings. And yet, we may reply, there is a simpler answer, namely that Josephus is writing a history rather than a book of theology, and the prophetic books have little history in them.

CAVALLETTI (826) cites a parallel between War 6.5 and the version of Isaiah 34. 5–6 preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

SCHALIT (827) comments on Josephus' statement (Ant. 11. 6) that the prophecy of Isaiah about the return to Zion was made 140 years before the destruction of Jerusalem, whereas an examination of the Bible (II Kings 20. 12, Isaiah 39. 1) shows that the prophecy was made in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, which, according to the 'Antiquities', occurred 125 years before the destruction of the Temple. SCHALIT explains the discrepancy by assuming that the dates are the result of different systems of reckoning, the number 140 being derived by counting traditional Jubilees and Sabbatical years, and the number 125 being arrived at by counting the reigns of the kings of Judah.

GREENBERG (828) cites a parallel between Josephus' account of Jesus, son of Ananias, who cried his message of woe for seven years and five months (War 6. 300–304) and the Biblical account of Ezekiel, whose dumbness lasted seven and a half years (Ezekiel 3. 24–27); the coincidence, despite GREENBERG, is hardly remarkable.

STECK (828a), from the data in the 'Antiquities', concludes that the presentation of the violent fate of the prophets in pre-exilic times was not merely a literary matter taken from the Bible but was also a living tradition.

SOGGIN (828b), noting the parallel between the earthquake mentioned in Antiquities 9. 222–227 and that in Zechariah 14. 4–5, asserts that the earthquake, of which traces were found in the excavations of Hazor in 1956, is to be identified with that of Amos 1. 1 and dated about 760 B.C.E., and that traditions about it, as shown in the passage in Zechariah, were current some centuries later. In Josephus (Ant. 9. 225) it is connected with a cultic transgression of King Uzziah, because of which he was smitten with leprosy.

DUVAL (828c), 1. 82–86, notes that Josephus (Ant. 9. 205–214) ignores the religious side of Jonah's conduct and mission and restricts himself to Jonah's political mission. DUVAL says that Josephus has sweetened and Hellenized the portrait of Jonah and that one discerns the Zeus of hospitality in the incident when the sailors judge it impious to hurl a stranger into the sea. As to Jonah being swallowed by the sea monster, Josephus, realizing that the reader may be incredulous, remarks (Ant. 9. 213) that it is a tale. We may comment that the behavior of the sailors is not necessarily an indication of a Greek concept of hospitality, since such an attitude was prevalent in the Near East generally, as we see, for example, in the Bible's portrait of Abraham. The notion that most sailors are G-d-fearing is, moreover, to be found in the Mishnah (Kiddushin 4. 14).

WOLF (828d), pp. 10–15, summarizing the references to Jeremiah in Josephus (Ant. 10. 78ff.), concludes that Josephus used only Biblical traditions, that we cannot discover in which language the book of Jeremiah was available to him, that if he used a Greek translation of the Bible it was in a form different from that of the Septuagint, and that one cannot discern the order of chapters in Josephus' copy of Jeremiah, since he made his selections from an historical viewpoint.

### 10.17: Ezra and Nehemiah: General (see 11.1)

- (829) HOWARD CROSBY: The Book of Nehemiah, Critically and Theologically Expounded, Including the Homiletical Sections of Dr. Schultz. In: JOHN PETER LANGE and PHILIP SCHAFF, A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, with Special Reference to Ministers and Students. Vol. 7. New York 1877. Pp. 1–62.
- (830) JAMES A. MONTGOMERY: The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology, and Literature. Philadelphia 1907.
- (831) STANLEY A. COOK: The Inauguration of Judaism. In: JOHN B. BURY, STANLEY A. COOK, FRANK E. ADCOCK, edd., Cambridge Ancient History 6, Cambridge 1927, pp. 167–199.
- (832) EGON H. JOHANNESSEN: Studier over Esras og Nehemjas Historie. Copenhagen 1946.
- (833) THOMAS DENTER: Die Stellung der Bücher Esdras im Kanon des alten Testamentes; eine kanongeschichtliche Untersuchung. Diss., Freiburg/Schweiz 1962.
- (834) WILHELM RUDOLPH: Esra und Nehemia: samt 3. Esra. In: OTTO EISSFELDT, ed., Handbuch zum Alten Testament, vol. 20, Tübingen 1949; 2nd ed., 1952–58.
- (835) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (836) SIGMUND MOWINCKEL: Studien zu dem Buche Ezra-Nehemia, 1 (Die Nehemia-Denkschrift). (Skifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, New Series 3). Oslo 1964.

- (837) JACOB M. MYERS: *Ezra, Nehemiah* (The Anchor Bible, 14). Garden City 1965.
- (838) C. G. TULAND: *Josephus, Antiquities*, Book XI: Correction or Confirmation of Biblical Post-Exilic Records? In: *Andrews University Seminary Studies* (Berrien Springs, Mich.) 4, 1966, pp. 176–192.
- (839) KARL-FRIEDRICH POHLMANN: *Studien zum dritten Esra. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem ursprünglichen Schluss des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*. Diss., Marburg 1968–69. Reprinted in: *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments* 104. Göttingen 1970. III: *Das Zeugnis des Josephus*. Pp. 74–126.
- (840) IDO HAMPEL: *The Historiography of Josephus Flavius for the Period 'Shivat Zion' – The Return of Zion* (in Hebrew). Diss., M.A., Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv 1969.
- (841) NISAN ARARAT: *Ezra and His Deeds in the Sources* (in Hebrew). Diss., Yeshiva University, New York 1971. Published in part as: *Ezra and His Deeds in the Biblical and Post-Biblical Sources* (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 17, 1971–72, pp. 451–492; 18, 1972–73, pp. 85–101, 130–132.
- (842) MORTON SMITH: *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament*. New York 1971.
- (842a) TESSA RAJAK: *Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World*. Diss., 2 vols., Oxford 1974.

It is generally recognized that for the period of Ezra and Nehemiah Josephus' version is garbled and unreliable or, in any case, very different from our Hebrew texts and the Greek text known as I or III Esdras (which consists of the last two chapters of II Chronicles, the entire book of Ezra except 1. 6, and Nehemiah 7. 73–8. 13, with a transposition and a non-canonical story introduced). CROSBY (829), p. 3, seems intemperate, however, in his language condemning Josephus' reliability for this period: "The chronology of Josephus is so wretchedly corrupt in the matter of Nehemiah, Ezra, Sanballat, etc., that it is a waste of time to give him attention."

MONTGOMERY (830), p. 68, and COOK (831), p. 171, call Josephus irresponsible and ignorant in his chronology for this period.

I have been unable to consult JOHANNESSEN (832), pp. 126–127, or DENTER (833).

RUDOLPH (834), pp. xvii and 107, cites Josephus' widely diverging paraphrase of Ezra-Nehemiah as evidence for HÖLSCHER's (835) thesis, pp. 1955–1960, that for the 'Antiquities' Josephus used neither the Hebrew nor the Greek Biblical text but rather a secondary source written by a Jewish Hellenist. In particular, RUDOLPH, p. xvii, says that a comparison of *Antiquities* 11. 32 with III Esdras 2 supports HÖLSCHER.

MOWINCKEL (836), pp. 25–28, concludes that Josephus used the account of Ezra before it has been combined with that of Nehemiah, and, perhaps, in an embellished version similar to the Greek Ezra (which he used directly or through an intermediate source); but on the basis of internal contradictions within Josephus' account he concludes that Josephus mixed up two sources, one of which he regards as "pure legend, without any historical worth." He finds some value, however, in Josephus' narrative and, on the basis of it, he emends the Biblical text in a number of places.

MYERS (837) summarizes the various attempts to rearrange the materials of Ezra-Nehemiah starting with the Greek Ezra and Josephus. He concludes, pp. xlii–xliv, that Josephus follows the order of the Greek Ezra but that he tele-

scoped the story of Nehemiah in a way that indicates that he knew more than he was disposed to relate.

TULAND (838), in an oversimplified discussion, notes a number of inaccuracies in Josephus' account, stemming from the confusion in the names of several Persian kings. Not only did Josephus disregard the Hebrew text but he used the Greek Ezra in a very arbitrary manner, seeking to have it conform to a preconceived historical pattern. But the fact that Josephus deviated so greatly from both the Hebrew and Greek texts of Ezra whereas he generally follows one or the other closely should, we may reply, lead us to conclude that most likely Josephus' source itself diverged widely from the Hebrew and Greek texts that we have. TULAND suggests that the theory that Josephus corrected the Biblical sequences of Persian kings is based on a misunderstanding, that the Hebrew and Greek Ezra are accounts arranged according to subject matter, whereas Josephus wrote a continuous historical narrative. TULAND does seem justified here, since elsewhere also in his paraphrase of the Bible Josephus rearranges his material (for example in putting the story of the Tower of Babel, Genesis 11, before the account of the nations descended from Noah's sons, Genesis 10), following similar principles.

POHLMANN (839) concludes that Josephus did not have our text of Ezra-Nehemiah, since he deviates greatly, particularly from Nehemiah 7. 5–13. 31; and yet, we may wonder why he did not know it if, as seems almost certain from *Against Apion* 1. 40, it was included in the canon. POHLMANN believes that it is possible to reconstruct the conclusion of III Esdras with the help of Josephus. In an exhaustive comparison between the Greek Ezra and Josephus 11. 1–158, POHLMANN notes that Josephus is sometimes very close to, at other times is far from, and at still other times is fairly close to the Greek, though, on the whole, Josephus is strongly dependent on III Esdras' vocabulary. His conclusion that Josephus took freedom in paraphrasing his source when he was not satisfied with the style or vocabulary is, we may add, borne out by his version of the 'Letter of Aristeas'. POHLMANN concludes that other changes are due to Hellenizations and apologetics for the sake of his readers; this, too, is borne out by my own studies of Josephus' variations in other portions of the Biblical narrative.

HAMPEL (840) concludes that Josephus did not know Ezra-Nehemiah in the Hebrew or in Aramaic or even in Greek, but that he used an unknown Jewish source, as well as an anti-Samaritan document. HAMPEL notes, in particular, the discrepancies in Josephus' chronology of the Persian kings and concludes that he is unreliable as historical evidence since he left out important passages and falsified facts for the sake of his Graeco-Roman public. If, however, we may comment, HAMPEL had examined Josephus in those passages where we can be reasonably sure of his source, he would have realized that Josephus can alternately be close to or show considerable divergence from his sources.

ARARAT (841) concludes that Ezra, the Apocryphal III Esdras, Josephus' account of Ezra, and the legends of the rabbinic sages pertaining to the Persian era are based upon a source which he calls the 'Comprehensive Chronicle'. He theorizes that the author of the Biblical Ezra revised the Chronicle in his desire

to stress the achievements of the House of Zadok, who ruled in his time, and to ignore those of the House of David.

SMITH (842), pp. 149–151, commenting on Antiquities 11. 297–12. 236, concludes that those elements which come from Jewish tradition are mostly hostile to the high priestly family, which regarded the Maccabean high priesthood with which Josephus had ties of blood as illegal. He suggests that the larger bulk of the tradition which did not survive was favorable to the high priests. It is true, we may comment, that the incident of the murder of a high priest in the Temple and the story of the building of the Samaritan temple do not reflect favorably on the high priests; but the high priests fare well in the account of Alexander and in the retelling of the 'Letter of Aristeas'.

I have not seen RAJAK (842a), who, in Appendix IV, comments on the chronology of the return of the Jews from Babylon and the connection of Josephus' account with the Biblical versions.

#### 10.18: Particular Passages in Ezra and Nehemiah (see 11.1)

- (843) ANDRÉS FERNÁNDEZ: Esdr. 9.9 y un texto de Josefo. In: *Biblica* 18, 1937, pp. 207–208.
- (844) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: La voce *gader* e un passo di Flavio Giuseppe. In: *Biblica* 16, 1935, pp. 443–445.
- (845) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah. In: SAMUEL LÖWINGER and JÓSEPH SOMOGYI, edd., *Ignace Goldziher Memorial Vol. 1*. Budapest 1948. Pp. 117–149. Reprinted in his: *The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament*. London 1952. Pp. 129–159.
- (846) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: Nehemiah's Mission and Its Background. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 37, 1954, pp. 528–561. Reprinted in his: *Men of G-d*. London 1963. Pp. 211–245.
- (847) ULRICH KELLERMANN: Nehemiah; Quellen, Überlieferung und Geschichte (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 102). Berlin 1967 (abbreviated version of Diss., Münster 1966).
- (848) WILHELM RUDOLPH: Esra und Nehemia: samt 3. Esra. In: OTTO EISSFELDT, ed., *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, vol. 20, Tübingen 1949. 2nd ed., 1952–58.
- (849) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (850) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: *Storia d'Israele*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed., Torino 1947. Trans. into French by PAUL AUVRAY: *Histoire d'Israël*. 2 vols. Paris 1939. Trans. into English by CLEMENT DELLA PENTA and RICHARD T. A. MURPHY: *The History of Israel*. 2 vols. Milwaukee 1955. Trans. into German by KONSTANZ FASCHIAN: *Geschichte Israels*. Wien 1955. Trans. into Polish: *Dzieje Izraela*. Warsaw 1956. Trans. into Spanish: *Historia de Israel*. Barcelona 1945.
- (851) HEINRICH SCHNEIDER, trans.: *Die Bücher Esra und Nehemia (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments, IV. Bd., 2 Abt.)*. Bonn 1959.
- (852) CHARLES C. TORREY: *The Apocryphal Literature: A Brief Introduction*. New Haven 1945.
- (853) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: A Chapter in the History of the War of the Parties in Jerusalem at the End of the Fifth Century and the Beginning of the Fourth Century B.C.E. (in Hebrew). In: MOSHE SCHWABE and JOSHUA GUTMANN, edd., *Sefer Yoḥanan Lewy: Meḥkarim be-Helenismus Yehudi*. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 252–272.



- (854) JOHN A. EMERTON: Did Ezra Go to Jerusalem in 428 B.C.? In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 17, 1966, pp. 1–19.
- (855) HENRY ENGLANDER: Problems of Chronology in the Persian Period of Jewish History. In: *Journal of Jewish Lore and Philosophy* 1, 1919, pp. 83–103.
- (856) SIGMUND MOWINCKEL: Studien zu dem Buche Ezra-Nehemia, 2 (Die Nehemia-Denkschrift), (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, Hist.-Filos. Klasse. New Series 5). Oslo 1964.
- (857) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 38, 1955–56, pp. 166–198. Reprinted in his: *Men of G-d*. London 1963. Pp. 246–276.
- (858) MOSES H. SEGAL: The Marriage of the Son of the High Priest with the Daughter of Sanballat and the Building of the Temple of Gerizim. In: MOSES D. (UMBERTO) CASSUTO, JOSEPH KLAUSNER, and JOSHUA GUTMANN, edd., *Sefer Simha Assaf*. Jerusalem 1953. Pp. 404–414.
- (859) FRANK M. CROSS: A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, 1975, pp. 4–18.

FERNÁNDEZ (843) takes issue with RICCIOTTI (844), who had cited War 1. 199 and Antiquities 14. 144 as supporting the meaning “wall of protection” for a phrase in the Septuagint version of III Esdras 9. 9.

ROWLEY (845)(846), relying on the Elephantine papyri of 408 B.C.E., dates Nehemiah in the time of Sanballat, and hence of the Persian king Artaxerxes I, and Ezra in the time of Artaxerxes II, i.e. later than Nehemiah. Josephus (Ant. 11. 159) wrongly places Nehemiah in the reign of Xerxes, despite the fact that Xerxes reigned for only twenty years, while Nehemiah returned to the court in the thirty-second year of the reign of his patron (Nehemiah 13. 6).

KELLERMANN (847), pp. 135–145, like RUDOLPH (848), adopts HÖLSCHER's (849) theory asserting that Josephus' source for Antiquities 11. 159–183 was neither the Hebrew nor the Greek text but rather an Alexandrian-Jewish midrash based on Nehemiah, plus the Nehemiah tradition of II Maccabees 1. 10–2. 18, and that there is no new material in Nehemiah's account; but, we may suggest, Josephus may have had a Greek text different from our extant one of III Esdras; and, moreover, we should, on the basis of Josephus' other variations of the Biblical text, allow for changes which Josephus himself introduced for stylistic or apologetic purposes.

RICCIOTTI (850) notes Josephus' error (Ant. 11. 179) in stating that Nehemiah's work of building a wall around Jerusalem took two years and four months, dating the completion in the twenty-eighth year of Xerxes' reign, which disagrees with Josephus' own statement (Ant. 11. 168), itself apparently incorrect, that the work was begun in the twenty-fifth year of Xerxes' reign; the Hebrew text, moreover (Nehemiah 6. 15), says that the work took only fifty-two days.

SCHNEIDER (851), p. 199, suggests that Josephus lengthened the time needed for building the wall because he feared, not realizing that in the pre-Hellenistic period almost all cities embraced only a fraction of their later extent, that if he stated that the work had been completed in only fifty-two days his pagan readers would conclude that the capital of the Jews was a small and in-

significant city. We may add that when it came to numbers Josephus elsewhere in his Biblical paraphrase also did not hesitate to take liberties.

TORREY (852), pp. 44–47, after comparing Josephus and III Esdras, concludes that Josephus is here following the Greek Bible. In particular, he notes that the first part of *Antiquities* 11. 181 refers to Nehemiah 7. 4, whereas the latter part refers to 11. 1, and he suggests that in the Greek text used by Josephus, Nehemiah 7 was immediately followed by chapter 11. But, as we have already noted, Josephus himself often takes considerable liberties in changing the order of his material.

SCHALIT (853) comments on *Antiquities* 11. 297–301, concerning the connection of the murder of Jesus the priest by his brother Joannes and the movement to set up another temple at Elephantine. Before the discovery of the Elephantine papyri most scholars had thought that Josephus was wrong in placing the incident in the time of Artaxerxes II rather than under Artaxerxes III, who is known to have had a general Bagoas, who, according to Josephus, had promised the high priesthood to Jesus. In general, and for good reason, SCHALIT prefers the evidence of Nehemiah to that of Josephus.

RICCIOTTI (850), who is generally critical of Josephus' accuracy, particularly for the Persian period, notes that the papyri vindicate Josephus' chronology with regard to Bagoas.

EMERTON (854) dates Ezra's trip to Jerusalem in 398 B.C.E. and says that the fact that Ezra 10. 6 says that he had dealings with Jehohanan does not necessarily prove that the date of such dealings was before 398 because Ezra would not have dealt with him after he had murdered his brother Jesus. Jesus, he suggests, was the aggressor and perhaps had the support of the pro-Samaritan party, though Josephus, we may note, gives no evidence for the latter assumption until after the murder.

ENGLANDER (855) attempts with more ingenuity than success to reconcile the conflict between the chronology of the Hebrew Nehemiah and that of Josephus regarding the Samaritan schism.

MOWINCKEL (856), pp. 104–118, says that Josephus' account (11. 297–347) of Sanballat and the establishment of the Samaritan temple on Gerizim is not pure legend, as so many claim, but that Josephus had an intermediate source.

RICCIOTTI (850), commenting on the account of Sanballat's daughter, concludes that this is the same incident as that recounted in Nehemiah 13. 28, and that Josephus attempted to harmonize these incidents but placed it more than a century later; the account in Nehemiah, he asserts, is clearly to be preferred. But, we may reply, there is no other instance of such an attempt at harmonization of similar incidents, and we may ask why Josephus would attempt to do so.

ROWLEY (857), comparing Josephus, whom he criticizes sharply, with the Hebrew version, concludes that Josephus' account is garbled; and the exact duplication of many of the elements found in Nehemiah's account a century earlier of the expulsion of Sanballat's son-in-law prevents us from accepting Josephus' version. But the fact that the accounts are parallel may indicate only that Josephus or his source had a stylized version of such events: it does not prove that there is no factual basis for the later version. ROWLEY claims that it is highly

improbable that the Samaritan temple could have been built so rapidly under such adverse conditions as Josephus claims. Indeed, the Elephantine papyri show that at the end of the fifth century there was still no complete breach between the Jews and the Samaritans.

SEGAL (858), noting that Josephus sometimes agrees and sometimes disagrees with Nehemiah, concludes that Josephus had another source. That he had such a source, whether written or oral, we may add, seems clear; but we must not minimize the deliberate changes in style and emphasis introduced by Josephus himself.

CROSS (859) comments that whether Josephus' list of high priests was defective or he merely telescoped the genealogy in writing the history of the fifth and fourth centuries, it is clear that he confused Yaddūa' II and III, as well as Sanballat I and III. Josephus, however, he adds, is probably correct in stating (Ant. 11. 312) that 'Israelites' frequently intermarried with the high priestly family in Jerusalem.

#### 10.19: Esther

- (860) LEWIS B. PATON: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther. New York 1908.
- (861) JOHANNES SCHILDENBERGER, ed. and trans.: Das Buch Esther, übersetzt und erklärt (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes, 4 Bd., 3 Abt.). Bonn 1941.
- (862) ELIAS J. BICKERMAN: Notes on the Greek Book of Esther. In: Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research 20, 1951, pp. 101–133.
- (863) CHARLES C. TORREY: The Older Book of Esther. In: Harvard Theological Review 37, 1944, pp. 1–40.
- (864) ISIDORE LÉVY: La Repudiation de Vasti. In: Actes du XXIIe Congrès International des Orientalistes (1948). Paris 1949.
- (865) HYMAN ROGOVIN: The Period of the Scroll of Esther according to Josephus (in Hebrew). In: Bitzaron 51, 1964–65, pp. 146–150.
- (866) ROSE-MARIE SEYBERLICH: Esther in der Septuaginta und bei Flavius Josephus. In: CHARLOTTE WELSKOPF, ed., Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt, Band 1: Alter Orient und Griechenland (II. Internationale Tagung der Fachgruppe Alte Geschichte der Deutschen Historiker-Gesellschaft vom 4.–8. Sept. 1962 in Stralsund). Berlin 1964. Pp. 363–366.
- (867) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Hellenizations in Josephus' Version of Esther. In: Transactions of the American Philological Association 101, 1970, pp. 143–170.
- (868) CAREY A. MOORE: On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 92, 1973, pp. 382–393.
- (868a) ROBERT HANHART, ed., Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae litterarum Gottingensis editum. Vol. 8.3: Esther. Göttingen 1966.
- (868b) HANS BARDTKE: Der Mardocheustag. In: GERT JEREMIAS, HEINZ-WOLFGANG KUHN, and HARTMUT STEGEMANN, edd., Tradition und Glaube; das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag. Göttingen 1971. Pp. 97–116.
- (868c) DAVID DAUBE: 'I believe' in *Jewish Antiquities* xi. 237. In: Journal of Jewish Studies 27, 1976, pp. 142–146.
- (868d) TESSA RAJAK: Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World. Diss., 2 vols, Oxford 1974.

PATON (860) asserts that Josephus' embellishments of the Esther story can hardly have been invented by Josephus himself but must have been derived from some traditional Jewish source. While this is a fair assumption, however, in point of fact most of Josephus' additions are not to be found in Talmudic literature.

SCHILDENBERGER (861), pp. 3 and 9, comments on Josephus' Greek text of Esther and, pp. 6–7, on the relation of Josippon to Josephus and to the midrashim with regard to Esther.

BICKERMAN (862) concludes that Josephus was following a particular recension of the Greek Esther, namely the one that was popular among the Jews in Rome, where Josephus wrote his 'Antiquities', but that this version is now lost. Such a hypothesis, we may comment, while possible, can hardly be proven, since, by BICKERMAN's own admission, the version is no longer extant.

TORREY (863) postulates, though with no apparent justification, that Josephus used only the Aramaic version in a Greek translation and that he did not know the Hebrew text; but he himself admits that Josephus agrees with the Hebrew text, which he regards, with no adequate evidence, as an abbreviated translation of an Aramaic original, in omitting certain accretions.

LÉVY (864) goes so far as to postulate that the Book of Esther was originally composed in Greek in substantially the form that it appears in Josephus, and that our Hebrew text is an extract from it. LÉVY presents the fantastic thesis that the author of the Book of Esther drew upon a multitude of episodes from the history of Herod and of his descendants, that Vashti is really Mariamne, that Ahasuerus is really Herod, and that the prologue is a thinly veiled version of the death of Mariamne. But the differences, we need hardly note, between the accounts of the Biblical book and the story of Herod are at least as striking as the similarities.

ROGOVIN (865), noting the differences between Josephus and the Biblical account of Esther, remarks that the most important difference is Josephus' omission of verse 2. 6. According to Josephus Mordecai and Esther were born not in Judah but in exile. But, we may remark, there are far more important differences; and, in any case, ROGOVIN does not note the Hellenizations.

SEYBERLICH (866) remarks that the second edict of King Ahasuerus is found only in Josephus (Ant. 11. 273–283) and in the Aramaic Targum Sheni 8. 12. To explain this she considers the possibility that Josephus' source may have been an Aramaic Targum-like paraphrase, but dismisses this by noting that since Josephus, at the time of the completion of the 'Antiquities', had spent twenty years in Rome, it is improbable that he used an Aramaic Targum, but rather that he had recalled some details of midrashim that he had heard in his earlier years. We may comment that the text of the edict in Josephus is actually a close paraphrase of Addition E of the Septuagint, that in view of the continuing contacts between the Jewish community of the land of Israel and that of Rome throughout this period it seems likely that Josephus would have had access to an Aramaic Targum, and that in view of the fact that Aramaic was Josephus' first language, he might well have recalled some of the Aramaic Targumim that he had heard in his younger days.

I (867) conclude that in stressing the royal origins of Esther and her beauty, in adding to the erotic aspect, and in highlighting the suspense and the irony, Josephus has incorporated Greek tragic and especially novelistic motifs and methods, thus illustrating how a Biblical narrative has become a Hellenistic romance. By thus dressing up his narrative, Josephus hoped to make his whole work more attractive to Greek readers, who would find in it many apologetic motifs and replies, explicit and implicit, to anti-Semitic propaganda.

MOORE (868) seeks to date Addition A (Mordecai's dream) and Addition C, lines 17–23 (the prayer of Mordecai) in the Septuagint from the fact that Josephus omits them. But this *argumentum ex silentio*, we may comment, is dangerous, since Josephus often omits details for other reasons, though the fact that they are not in the Old Latin version but are in the Vulgate may indicate that they were not part of the recognized Septuagint in Josephus' own day.

HANHART (868a), pp. 36–38, notes that for the text of Esther Josephus often joins the Septuagint against the Lucianic text even when the Septuagint diverges from the Hebrew Masoretic text, though he sometimes joins the Masoretic text against both the Septuagint and the Lucianic text.

BARDTKE (868b), p. 113, presents a very brief, unanalytical summary of Josephus' modifications of the Biblical narrative of Esther, noting that Mordecai has been weakened but that Esther is not so weak.

DAUBE (868c) notes that whereas according to Esther 5. 2, King Ahasuerus was favorably disposed to Esther immediately on seeing her and whereas, according to the Addition to Esther, "G-d changed the spirit of the king into mildness," Josephus (Ant. 11. 237) says that the king changed his feeling by the will of G-d, adding οἶμαι ("I believe"). DAUBE suggests, in explanation, that Josephus probably saw the scene of Esther before Ahasuerus as a prefigurement of his own experience before Vespasian. He notes, moreover, that the portrayal of Ahasuerus as attended by guards with axes is based neither on the Bible nor on the Apocrypha, but that Vespasian did indeed have such guards. But, we may comment, Josephus' modification is in line with his general tendency (compare his treatment of Samson, Ant. 5. 276–277, for example) to diminish the role of G-d and to omit reference to the supernatural. Thus in Antiquities 11. 240, Josephus says that Esther fainted as soon as she saw Ahasuerus "looking so great and handsome and terrible," whereas the Apocryphal Addition (D 13), which is Josephus' source at this point, reports that Esther said that she had seen Ahasuerus as an angel of G-d.

I have not seen RAJAK (868d), who, in Appendix III, notes evidence of Josephus' dependence upon the Septuagint version of Esther.

## 11: Josephus as Historian of the Post-Biblical Period (until 63 B.C.E.): General Issues

### 11.0: Josephus' Treatment of the Post-Biblical Period: General

- (869) WILLIAM O. E. OESTERLEY: *The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period: The Background of Christianity*. London 1941.
- (870) ROLAND DE VAUX: *Israel. La Période Grecque*. In: *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Vol. 4. Paris 1969. Pp. 769–777.
- (871) MARTIN HENGEL: *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, Bd. 10). Tübingen 1969; 2nd ed. 1973. Trans. into English by JOHN BOWDEN: *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Philadelphia 1974.
- (872) NORMAN H. SNAITH: *The Jews from Cyrus to Herod*. London 1949.
- (873) MARTIN NOTH: *Geschichte Israels*. Göttingen 1950; 6th ed., 1966. Trans. into English by STANLEY GODMAN: *The History of Israel*. London 1958; 2nd ed., 1960.
- (874) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *Historical Geography of Palestine from the End of the Babylonian Exile to the Arab Conquest (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem 1949; 2nd ed., 1951; 3rd ed., 1962. Trans. into English: *The Holy Land from the Persian to the Arab Conquests (536 B.C. to A.D. 640): A Historical Geography*. Grand Rapids 1966 (trans. of 3rd Hebrew ed. with numerous revisions). Rev. ed., 1977. Another trans. by CHARLES WEISS and PAMELA FITTON: *A History of the Holy Land*. London 1969.
- (875) LAURENCE E. BROWNE: *From Babylon to Bethlehem; the story of the Jews for the last five centuries before Christ* (2nd ed., revised and enlarged with the assistance of Matthew Black). Cambridge 1951.
- (876) SALO W. BARON: *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Rev. ed., vols. 1 and 2. New York 1952.
- (877) AZRIEL SHOCHAT: *The History of Israel: The Period of the Second Temple. A Text-book for High Schools (in Hebrew)*. Tel-Aviv 1953; 5th ed., 1962.
- (878) MERRILL C. TENNEY: *The New Testament: An Historical and Analytic Survey*. London 1954.
- (879) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: *Storia d'Israele*. 4th ed., Torino 1947. Trans. into French by PAUL AUVRAY: *Histoire d'Israël*. 2 vols. Paris 1939. Trans. into English by CLEMENT DELLA PENTA and RICHARD T. A. MURPHY: *The History of Israel*. 2 vols. Milwaukee 1955. Trans. into German by KONSTANZ FASCHIAN: *Geschichte Israels*. Wien 1955. Trans. into Polish: *Dzieje Izraela*. Warsaw 1956. Trans. into Spanish: *Historia de Israel*. Barcelona 1945.
- (880) RALPH MARCUS: *The Challenge of Greco-Roman Culture; The Achievement of Hellenistic Judaism*. In: LEO W. SCHWARZ, *Great Ages and Ideas of the Jewish People*. New York 1956. Pp. 95–121; 122–139.

- (881) CHARLES F. PFEIFFER: *Between the Testaments*. Grand Rapids 1959.
- (882) JOSEPH BONSRIVEN: *De l'exil à la ruine de Jérusalem*. In: ANDRÉ ROBERT and ALPHONSE TRICOT, edd., *Initiation Biblique: Introduction à l'Étude des Saintes Écritures*. 3rd ed., Paris 1954. Pp. 722–732. Trans. into English by EDWARD P. ARBEZ and MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE: *Guide to the Bible*. Paris 1960.
- (883) ALPHONSE E. TRICOT: *Le monde juif*. In: ANDRÉ ROBERT and ALPHONSE TRICOT, edd., *Initiation Biblique: Introduction à l'Étude des Saintes Écritures*. 3rd ed., Paris 1959. Pp. 734–792. Trans. into English by EDWARD P. ARBEZ and MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE: *Guide to the Bible*. Paris 1960.
- (884) MARTINUS A. BEEK: *Geschiedenis van Israël, van Abraham tot Bar Kochba; een poging*. 2nd ed., Zeist 1960. Trans. into German by WOLFGANG HIRSCH: *Geschichte Israels von Abraham bis Bar Kochba*. Stuttgart 1961; 2nd ed., 1966. Trans. into English by ARNOLD J. POMERANS: *A Short History of Israel from Abraham to Bar Cochba*. London 1963 (= *Concise History of Israel from Abraham to the Bar Cochba Rebellion*. New York 1963).
- (885) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: *The Jews in the Graeco-Roman World* (in Hebrew), ed. M. AMIT. Tel-Aviv 1960.
- (886) GAALYAHU CORNFELD, ed.: *Daniel to Paul. Jews in Conflict with Graeco-Roman Civilization: Historical and Religious Background to the Hasmoneans, Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament World, Early Christianity, and the Bar Kochba War*. New York 1962.
- (887) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959.
- (888) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *King Herod: The Man and His Work* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1960. Trans. into German by Jehoschua Amir: *König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk* (*Studia Judaica*, 4). Berlin 1968.
- (889) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Rise and Fall of the Judaeen State: A Political, Social and Religious History of the Second Commonwealth*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia 1962. Trans. into Hebrew by MEIR ZELTZER: *History of the Second Temple*. Jerusalem 1968. Vol. 2: 37 B.C.E.–66 C.E. Philadelphia 1967. Vol. 3: 66 C.E.–120 C.E. Philadelphia 1978.
- (890) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *Israel and the Nations, from the Exodus to the Fall of the Second Temple*. Exeter 1963. 2nd ed., 1969.
- (891) ALEXANDER J. BRONKHORST: *De geschiedenis van Israël van Alexander de Grote tot Bar Kochba*. Baarn 1964. Trans. into German by AUGUST DAHL: *Von Alexander bis Bar Kochba. Vierhundert Jahre Fremdherrschaft in Israel*. Wuppertal 1967.
- (892) WERNER FOERSTER: *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, I: Das Judentum Palästinas zur Zeit Jesu und der Apostel*. 3rd ed. Hamburg 1959. Trans. into English by GORDON E. HARRIS: *From the Exile to Christ: A Historical Introduction to Palestinian Judaism*. Philadelphia 1964.
- (893) CLAUD SCHEDL: *Geschichte des Alten Testaments*. Vol. 5. Innsbruck 1964.
- (894) BO REICKE: *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. Die biblische Welt 500 v. – 100 n. Chr.* (Sammlung Töpelmann, Reihe 2, Bd. 2). Berlin 1965. Trans. into English by DAVID E. GREEN: *The New Testament Era. The World of the Bible from 500 B.C. to A.D. 100*. Philadelphia 1968.
- (895) MORTON SMITH: *Palestinian Judaism from Alexander to Pompey*. In: PIERRE GRIMAL, ed., *Hellenism and the Rise of Rome*. New York 1968. Pp. 250–261. Trans. by A. M. SHERIDAN SMITH from: *Der Hellenismus und der Aufstieg Roms*. Frankfurt am Main 1965. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York 1977. Pp. 183–197.
- (896) URIEL RAPAPORT: *A History of Israel in the Period of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1967.
- (897) CHARLES F. PFEIFFER: *Jerusalem through the Ages*. Grand Rapids 1967.
- (898) DAVID S. RUSSELL: *The Jews from Alexander to Herod* (*The New Clarendon Bible, Old Testament*, Vol. 5). London 1967.

- (899) GEORGE H. BOX: *Judaism in the Greek Period from the Rise of Alexander the Great to the Intervention of Rome (333 to 63 B.C.).* (= original version of *The New Clarendon Bible, Old Testament*, vol. 5). Oxford 1932.
- (900) HUGH ANDERSON: *The Intertestamental Period.* In: WILLIAM BARCLAY et al., ed., *The Bible and History.* London 1968. Pp. 153–244.
- (901) GORDON ROBINSON: *The New Testament World.* In: WILLIAM BARCLAY et al., ed., *The Bible and History.* London 1968. Pp. 245–356.
- (902) MARCEL SIMON and ANDRÉ BENOIT: *Le judaïsme et le christianisme antique; d'Antiochus Épiphane à Constantin* (*Nouvelle Clio*, 10). Paris 1968.
- (903) MENAHEM STERN: *The Period of the Second Temple (in Hebrew).* In: HAIM H. BEN-SASSON, ed., *History of the Jewish People.* Vol. 1: *The Ancient Times.* Tel-Aviv 1969. Pp. 177–294. Trans. into English. London 1976. Pp. 185–303.
- (904) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men, and Events.* New York 1969.
- (905) THOMAS CORBISHLEY: *The History of Israel.* Vol. 2: 130 B.C.–A.D. 135 (= REGINALD C. FULLER, ed., *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*). London 1969.
- (906) JOHN GRAY: *A History of Jerusalem.* New York 1969.
- (907) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: JOHN GRAY, *A History of Jerusalem.* In: *Classical Journal* 69, 1973–74, pp. 85–88.
- (908) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *A Clash of Ideologies: Palestine under the Seleucids and Romans.* In: ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE, ed., *The Crucible of Christianity; Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith.* London 1969. Pp. 47–76.
- (909) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: *The Jews in Egypt and Cyrenaica during the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods.* In: L. A. THOMPSON and JOHN FERGUSON, ed., *Africa in Classical Antiquity.* Ibadan 1969. Pp. 110–131.
- (910) FRANCIS E. PETERS: *The Harvest of Hellenism: A History of the Near East from Alexander the Great to the Triumph of Christianity.* New York 1970.
- (911) JOHN M. ALLEGRO: *The Chosen People. A Study of Jewish History from the Time of the Exile until the Revolt of Bar Kocheba. Sixth Century B.C. to Second Century A.D.* London 1971; Garden City, New York 1972.
- (912) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Hellenism and the Jews.* In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 295–301.
- (913) MENAHEM STERN: *History: Erez Israel – Second Temple (The Hellenistic-Roman Period).* In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 625–642.
- (914) MICHAEL GRANT: *The Jews in the Roman World.* New York 1973.
- (915) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135).* Vol. 1, revised and edited by GÉZA VERMÈS and FERGUS MILLAR. Edinburgh 1973. Vol. 2. Edinburgh 1979.
- (916) SOLOMON ZEITLIN, ed.: *Solomon Zeitlin's Studies in the Early History of Judaism.* New York 1973.
- (917) SHMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, ed., in co-operation with DAVID FLUSSER and WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section 1).* Assen 1974.
- (918) SHMUEL SAFRAI: *The Jewish People in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew).* Tel-Aviv, 1970. Trans. into German by YEHOShUA AMIR: *Das jüdische Volk im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels.* Neukirchen–Vluyn 1978.
- (919) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: *When Chosen Peoples Fall.* To be published by Brill, Leiden.
- (919a) ERNST LUDWIG EHRLICH: *Geschichte Israels von den Anfängen bis zur Zerstörung des Tempels (70 n. Chr.).* Berlin 1958. Trans. into English by JAMES BARR: *A Concise*



History of Israel: From the Earliest Times to the Destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70. London 1962.

- (919b) URIEL RAPPAPORT and I. SHATZMAN: History of Ancient Times among the Nations and in Israel, ed. by ZVI YAVETZ (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1963.
- (919c) YEHOShUA GUTTMANN and MENAHEM STERN: From the Babylonian Exile to the Bar Kochba Revolt. In: DAVID BEN-GURION, ed., The Jews in Their Land. London 1966. Pp. 104–163.
- (919d) URIEL RAPPAPORT: A History of Israel in the Period of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1967; 2nd, enlarged ed., 1976, 1978.
- (919e) G. REESE: Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums. Diss., Heidelberg 1967.
- (919f) HARRY T. FRANK: Bible, Archaeology and Faith. Nashville 1971.
- (919g) W. STEWART McCULLOUGH: The History and Literature of the Palestinian Jews from Cyrus to Herod: 550 B.C. to 4 B.C. Toronto 1975.
- (919h) HENRY L. ELLISON: From Babylon to Bethlehem: The Jewish People from the Exile to the Messiah. Exeter 1976.
- (919i) PAOLO SACCHI: Storia del mondo giudaico (Manuali universitari, 1: Per lo studio delle scienze dell' Antichità). Torino 1976.
- (919j) WERNER DOMMERSHAUSEN: Die Umwelt Jesu. Politik und Kultur in neutestamentlicher Zeit. Theologisches Seminar. Freiburg 1977.
- (919k) HENRY VOOGD: Seedtime and Harvest: A Popular Study of the Period between the Testaments. Washington 1977.
- (919l) HANS G. KIPPENBERG: Religion und Klassenbildung im antiken Judäa: eine religionssoziologische Studie zum Verhältnis von Tradition und gesellschaftlicher Entwicklung (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, Bd. 14). Habilitationsschrift, Free University of Berlin 1975. Göttingen 1978.
- (919m) DONALD E. GOWAN: Bridge between the Testaments: A Reappraisal of Judaism from the Exile to the Birth of Christianity (Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 14). Pittsburgh 1976.

OESTERLEY (869), pp. 16–41, presents a general introduction, dependent, in a largely uncritical way, on Josephus, to the history of the Jews during the last three pre-Christian centuries.

DE VAUX (870) presents a balanced summary of Jewish history during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, with particular emphasis on the roles of Antiochus Epiphanes and Herod, anticipating HENGEL (871) in stressing that the archaeological finds indicate a strong influence of Hellenism throughout the period.

SNAITH (872), writing for the general reader, generally cites Josephus without any criticism.

NOTH (873) cites Josephus extremely often, but almost always in a non-critical manner.

AVI-YONAH's (874) survey is carefully annotated. He generally accepts Josephus but shows, for example, that in his use of terms for the administration of the land of Israel Josephus is sometimes anachronistic. He excellently co-ordinates Josephus and archaeological finds, noting, for example, that the relatively small amount of material damage caused by the war against Rome in 66–73 (i. e. 74), as seen in archaeological finds, confirms Josephus' account. The new edition of 1977 adds an index of place names.

BROWNE (875) is a very brief, general account, with particular attention to religious developments.

BARON (876) is usually fair, well-balanced, critical, and yet highly readable, with excellent command of the sources, both primary and especially secondary.

SHOCHAT (877) is a balanced, elementary survey intended for high schools, with brief, clear summaries of Josephus' activities in Galilee (pp. 147–148) and of his status as an historian (pp. 163–165), making good use of recent scholarship, especially in archaeology.

TENNEY (878) is a popular, uncritical survey of Jewish history from the time of the Babylonian exile to that of Bar Kochba.

RICCIOTTI'S (879) deservedly popular work is particularly noteworthy for its critical, perhaps at times hypercritical, approach to Josephus.

MARCUS (880) has a popular and highly readable account, with a number of fine critical insights.

PFEIFFER (881) has a popular summary of the Persian and Hellenistic periods based chiefly on Josephus.

BONSIRVEN (882) and TRICOT (883) have general, competent, up-to-date surveys, the latter concentrating particularly on the sects at the time of Jesus.

BEEK (884) has a popular history which does not approach Josephus critically.

TCHERIKOVER (885) is a collection of essays by one of the great scholars in the field, particularly critical in approaching Josephus and in co-ordinating him with the *papyri*.

CORNFELD (886) is a popular account greatly indebted to TCHERIKOVER (887) and SCHALIT (888).

ZEITLIN (889) has issued the three volumes of a work intended both for the general reader and the scholar, the much-awaited summary of his prolific scholarly research during the past sixty years. The views are stimulating and often highly original. The dogmatism is, however, occasionally jarring; for it is not often that ZEITLIN cites scholarly opinions that differ with his own. Josephus, of course, is ZEITLIN's main source; but, according to ZEITLIN, Josephus was not a critical historian and, in fact, used in his writings a variety of sources without recognizing that they were mutually contradictory. The third volume carries the history to 135 C.E. and includes excursus on the sources, including especially Josephus, and an explanation of why, according to ZEITLIN, the Dead Sea Scrolls cannot be considered a source for this period.

BRUCE (890) is a popular handbook which often cites Josephus, generally uncritically.

BRONKHORST (891) has a simple, easily intelligible survey, generally critical of Josephus as a source, and concluding that to Josephus literary effort was more important than historical reliability.

FOERSTER (892) has a considerable analysis of the social, cultural, and especially religious situation in the land of Israel at the time of Jesus.

SCHEDL'S (893) history extends from Alexander to the Maccabees (pp. 245–259) and from the Maccabees to 63 B.C. (pp. 304–385). It is based largely on Josephus via SCHÜRER, on whom he is heavily dependent.

REICKE (894) is considerably more scholarly in citing his sources than most introductions of this sort, though he generally does not criticize Josephus. His work, which has the virtue of being intelligible to the layman, neglects Hellenistic Judaism as a manifestation of Judaism in its own right. The English translation has some corrections and bibliographical additions.

SMITH (895) presents a survey, especially of the religious history of Judaism, which is critical of Josephus.

RAPAPORT (896) is a generally sound and fair popular textbook intended for the upper classes of high school in Israel.

PFEIFFER (897) has a brief historical survey, with pp. 33–36 dealing with Hellenistic Jerusalem and 37–48 with a description of the city at the time of Jesus.

RUSSELL (898) is a balanced, stimulating survey which enlarges upon his predecessor, BOX (899), by adding the period from Pompey through Herod and by giving more attention to religious ideas and sects.

ANDERSON (900) and ROBINSON (901) write essays intended for the layman.

In a work marked by clarity SIMON and BENOIT (902) have produced an extremely useful handbook which contains a huge, if selective, bibliography, a discussion of major problems in Josephan scholarship, and directions for further research. As most recent scholars, they conclude that Jews were not particularly hostile to Hellenism. The work, however, suffers from having Judaism treated primarily as the necessary background of the study of Christianity and from neglect of the rabbinic sources. The discussion of important problems remaining to be investigated and of directions for proceeding with this work is of considerable value.

STERN (903) presents a sound, if unexciting, survey of Jewish political history, with relatively little attention given to the social, religious, and economic currents.

BRANDON (904) has gathered a number of his popular essays previously published in 'History Today' and in the 'Bulletin of the John Rylands Library', including the following: 'Herod the Great: Judea's Most Able but Most Hated King' (pp. 209–223); 'Pontius Pilate in History and Legend' (pp. 254–267); 'The Fall of Jerusalem, A.D. 70' (pp. 268–281); 'The Zealots: The Jewish Resistance against Rome, A.D. 6–73' (pp. 282–297); and 'Josephus: Renegade of Patriot?' (pp. 298–309).

CORBISHLEY (905) has a brief, clear, authoritative survey of political events making critical use of Josephus.

GRAY (906), pp. 123–193, in his popular account, betrays certain commonly held prejudices, misinformation, and questionable judgments which I try to document in my review (907).

SCHALIT's (908) popular historical survey is lavishly illustrated.

SMALLWOOD (909) has a cursory general historical survey, based largely on Josephus.

PETERS (910) has a very readable chapter (pp. 261–308) on Hellenism and the Jews which, for a textbook, often has remarkably independent views.

ALLEGRO (911) has a lively, popular survey, based largely on Josephus, which fortunately keeps to a minimum his peculiar theories on the sacred mushroom as a source of Biblical stories and of the origin of the Hebrew G-d. [See *infra*, p. 912.]

My survey (912) summarizes the nature of Hellenization both in the Diaspora and in the land of Israel, in literature (especially Josephus), and in everyday life. It argues that while Greek was widely known among Jews, the level of knowledge of it in the land of Israel was not high.

STERN (913) has a brief but sound survey based largely on a critical use of Josephus.

GRANT (914) has a popular, well-written survey, critical of his chief source, Josephus, covering the period from the Maccabees to the late pagan empire.

The revision of SCHÜRER (915) is thorough, and the bibliography has been completely updated. All references to quotations and sources have been modernized. New archaeological evidence has been systematically added and evaluated. SCHÜRER's prejudice against rabbinic evidence has been utterly removed. A third volume is to follow.

A number of ZEITLIN's (916) many essays in the field have been reissued, generally without change.

SAFRAI and STERN (917) have issued the first volume of an historical work on the relationship between Judaism and Christianity during the first two centuries. The work, especially the essays by STERN, shows keen criticism of the sources, notably Josephus.

SAFRAI's (918) work is a series of popular lectures.

GOLDSTEIN (919) endeavors to show that the Babylonians, Persians, and Jews exhibit common patterns under foreign domination and draw upon one another's heritages, honestly believing in every case that when they borrowed they were only recovering what was their own.

EHRlich (919a) has a very brief survey showing critical use of Josephus.

RAPPAPORT and SHATZMAN (919b) have a textbook for the ninth grade of Israeli high schools co-ordinating ancient general and Jewish history, with frequent dependence upon Josephus.

GUTTMANN and STERN (919c) have a popular, lavishly illustrated survey.

RAPPAPORT (919d), writing for pupils in high schools and for intelligent general readers, co-ordinates Josephus and archaeology, and especially numismatics.

I have not seen REESE (919e).

FRANK (919f), pp. 218–264, presents a popular history of Palestine from 586 B.C.E. to the fall of the Temple in 70, with close co-ordination of archaeology with Josephus, but with uncritical use of Josephus.

MCCULLOUGH (919g) gives a general, dry survey, which is, on the whole, uncritical of Josephus.

ELLISON (919h), covering the period from the Babylonian exile to the destruction of the Temple in 70, is tendentious in seeking to discern why Palestinian Judaism rejected Jesus and why it was 'ruined' less than forty years later.

SACCHI (919i) surveys the history of Judaism from its beginnings until the time of Jesus, with emphasis on Jewish theology.

DOMMERSHAUSEN (919j) presents a political, economic, social, cultural, and religious history of the Jews from the Persian period to 70 as an introduction to the New Testament world.

VOOGD (919k) briefly discusses the political, cultural, and religious history of the Jews from the Persian through the Roman period.

KIPPENBERG (919l), following the path of MAX WEBER in using the comparative method, has written a social-anthropological study of Jewish history from 539 B.C.E. to 137 C.E., with particular emphasis on class relationships, the opposition of religion to politics, and the relationship between agrarian problems and political movements.

GOWAN (919m) has an introductory account but identifies disputed issues and presents his own critical interpretation.

### 11.1: Josephus' Treatment of the Persian Period

(919p) HAROLD M. PARKER: Artaxerxes III Ochus and Psalm 44. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 68, 1977–78, pp. 152–168.

(919q) GEO WIDENGREN: The Persian Period. In: JOHN H. HAYES and J. MAXWELL MILLER, *Israelite and Judaeon History*. Philadelphia 1977. Pp. 489–538.

(919r) H. G. M. WILLIAMSON: The Historical Value of Josephus' *Jewish Antiquities* XI. 297–301. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 28, 1977, pp. 49–66.

(919s) ALFRED SEMPER: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der jüdischen Gemeinde Palästinas in der persischen Zeit. Diss., 2 vols., Ph.D., Wien 1966.

PARKER (919p) says that Psalm 44 reflects the reaction of those Jews who saw their fellow-Jews carried into exile after the Persian king Artaxerxes III Ochus put down the Phoenician revolt in 345–344 B.C.E. (cf. Hecataeus of Abdera, ap. Against Apion 1. 194). He argues (p. 161) that whether the incident refers to Artaxerxes II or III, it indicates that relations between Persians and Jews had deteriorated considerably in the fourth century B.C.E.

WIDENGREN (919q), pp. 493–495, concludes that for the Persian period it is difficult to assess the full value of Josephus.

WILLIAMSON (919r) notes that, according to Josephus, the Joannes the high priest who, while Bagoses was governor, murdered his brother Jesus is to be identified with Johanan the second high priest following Eliashib (Nehemiah 12.22). This identification has been accepted by most scholars, inasmuch as this same Johanan is known from the Elephantine Papyri to have been high priest while Bagohi was governor. Using form-critical analysis, however, WILLIAMSON concludes that Josephus drew upon an independent source in narrating the incident, imposed his own interpretation upon that source, and reduced the Persian period by at least as much as two generations. WILLIAMSON suggests that Josephus' source originally referred the incident to the time of Artaxerxes III, whose general Bagoses was, and that the background was the division of Judah into pro-Egyptian and pro-Persian factions in 344–343 during the

revolt in Egypt. WILLIAMSON, on the basis of the names, the unlikelihood of fabrication, and the possibility that the story had been preserved in some priestly or Temple chronicle, believes that Josephus' dates are reliable. In one respect Josephus did have independent knowledge, namely the order of the first Persian kings. He concludes that the sharp divisions in the Jerusalem community, and the priesthood in particular, with which we are familiar from the time of Ezra and Nehemiah, were not restricted to the fifth century B.C.E. but continued much longer.

I have not seen SEMPER (919s).

## 11.2: Josephus' Treatment of the Hellenistic Period: General

- (920) MORTON SMITH: *Judaism in Palestine: I. To the Maccabean Revolt*. Diss., Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1957.
- (921) MORTON SMITH: *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament*. New York 1971.
- (922) FELIKS GRYGLEWICZ: *Pałestyna na Seleucydów*. In: *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL* 3 (7). Lublin 1959. Pp. 89–102.
- (923) HARALD HEGERMANN: *Das hellenistische Judentum*. In: JOHANNES LEIPOLDT and WALTER GRUNDMANN, edd., *Umwelt des Urchristentums*. Vol. 1. Berlin 1965. Pp. 292–345.
- (924) NAOMI G. COHEN: *Jews in the Armies of Hellenistic Kings* (in Hebrew). In: *Maḥanaim* 112, 1967, pp. 76–85.
- (925) EDOUARD WILL: *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av.J.-C.)*. Vol. 2. Nancy 1967.
- (926) MARTIN HENGEL: *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* Tübingen 1969; 2nd ed. 1973. Trans. into English by JOHN BOWDEN: *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Philadelphia 1974.
- (927) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959.
- (928) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. (Bollingen Series, 37). New York 1953–68.
- (929) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *How Much Greek in Jewish Palestine?* In: ALEXANDER ALTMANN, ed., *Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University: Studies and Texts*, vol. 1: *Biblical and Other Studies*. Cambridge, Mass. 1963. Pp. 123–141. Rpt. in: SAUL LIEBERMAN, *Texts and Studies*. New York 1974. Pp. 216–234. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York 1977. Pp. 325–343.
- (930) JOSEPH G. WALSER: *A Study of Selected Economic Factors and Their Contribution to the Understanding of the History of Palestine during the Hellenistic Period*. Diss., Ph.D., Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, 1969.
- (931) JACQUES BRIEND: *Jérusalem depuis d'exil jusqu'au roi Hérode*. In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 117, 1970, pp. 2–5.
- (932) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed.: *The World History of the Jewish People, First Series: Ancient Times*. Vol. 6: *The Hellenistic Age: Political History of Jewish Palestine from 332 B. C.E. to 67 B.C.E.* New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1972.
- (933) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *The Battles in the Books of Maccabees* (in Hebrew). In: MOSHE SCHWABE and JOSHUA GUTMANN, edd., *Sefer Yoḥanan Lewy: Meḥkarim be-Hellenismus Yehudi*. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 13–24.

- (933a) JACK FINEGAN: *Light from the Ancient Past: The Archaeological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion*. Princeton 1946; 2nd ed. 1959.
- (933b) HAJIME INOUE: *Judaism and Hellenism: Compromise and Opposition from the Maccabees to the Herods* (in Japanese). In: Okayamadaigaku hobungakubu gakujiutsu kiyo (Quarterly Review, Departments of Law and Literature, Okayama University), 1952, pp. 1–9.
- (933c) JUDAH GOLDIN: *The Period of the Talmud (135 B.C.E.–1035 C.E.)*. In: LOUIS FINKELSTEIN, ed., *The Jews*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia 1949. Pp. 115–215 (New York 1970, pp. 119–224).
- (933d) ROBERT M. GRANT: *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*. New York 1963.
- (933e) CARL SCHNEIDER: *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus*. Vol. 1. München 1967.
- (933f) MENAHEM STERN: *The Period of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). In HAIM H. BEN-SASSON, ed., *History of the Jewish People*. Vol. 1: *The Ancient Times*. Tel-Aviv 1969. Pp. 177–294. Trans. into English: London 1976. Pp. 185–303.
- (933g) ZVI TAMARI: *Tannaitic Literature as a Source for Jewish History from Simon the Just to Johanan ben Zakkai*. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1972.
- (933h) ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge 1975.
- (933i) I. VARSAT: *Les Juifs dans l’Egypte grecque et romaine. Aspects sociaux, politiques et institutionnels*. Paris 1975.
- (933j) MARTIN HENGEL: *Juden, Griechen und Barbaren. Aspekte der Hellenisierung des Judentums in vorchristlicher Zeit* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 76). Stuttgart 1976. Trans. into English by JOHN BOWDEN: *Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period*. Philadelphia 1980.
- (933k) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Hengel’s Judaism and Hellenism in Retrospect*. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96, 1977, pp. 371–382.
- (933l) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *Hellenism and Judaism*. In: STANLEY M. WAGNER and ALLEN D. BRECK, ed., *Great Confrontations in Jewish History* (University of Denver, The J. M. Goodstein Lectures on Judaica, 1975). Denver 1977. Pp. 21–38.
- (933m) FERGUS MILLAR: *The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel’s ‘Judaism and Hellenism’*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29, 1978, pp. 1–21.
- (933n) PETER SCHÄFER: *The Hellenistic and Maccabean Periods*. In: JOHN H. HAYES and J. MAXWELL MILLER, *Israelite and Judaeon History*. Philadelphia 1977. Pp. 539–604.
- (933o) K. MATTHIAE: *Chronologische Übersichten und Karten zur spätjüdischen und urchristlichen Zeit*. Stuttgart 1978.
- (933p) GEZA VERMES: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. Cleveland 1978.
- (933q) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *The Jews in Greek and Latin Literature*. To be published in: MENAHEM STERN, ed., *The Jewish Diaspora in the Second Temple Period* (World History of the Jewish People, Second Temple Period, vol. 4).
- (933r) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *The Second Temple (332 B.C.–A.D. 70); Jews, Romans and Byzantines (70–640)*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, ed., *A History of the Holy Land*. Jerusalem, London, New York 1969. Pp. 109–184.
- (933s) LESTER T. WHITELOCKE: *The Development of Jewish Religious Thought in the Inter-Testamental Period*. New York 1976.
- (933t) B. JAY: *Le monde du Nouveau Testament* (Collection Théologique). Yaoundé 1978.
- (933u) S. DUVENAGE: *Die décor van die Nuwe Testament. ’n Kultuur-historiese Agtergrondstudie. Leerboeke vir Godsdiensoonderrig en Bybelkunde*. Pretoria n. d. (1979?).
- (933v) PAUL JOHNSON: *Civilizations of the Holy Land*. London 1979.
- (933w) HANS G. KIPPENBERG and GERD A. WEWERS: *Textbuch zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament. Das neue Testament Deutsch-Ergänzungsreihe, 8). Göttingen 1979.
- (933x) SEAN FREYNE: *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (University of Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity, 5). Notre Dame, Indiana 1980.

SMITH's (920) dissertation has now been issued in thoroughly revised form (921).

I have been unable to read GRYGLEWICZ (922).

HEGERMANN (923) has a brief general survey.

COHEN (924) is a popular survey but based on sound critical scholarship co-ordinating papyri and Josephus and explaining apparent discrepancies.

WILL (925) systematically and conscientiously cites primary and secondary sources for each point that he makes. On pp. 477–478 he briefly discusses Josephus as a source, as well as Josephus' sources, and concludes that his work is mediocre but indispensable to the historian.

A work of clearly major importance is HENGEL's (926) massive volume, thoroughly researched and annotated with an extensive bibliography and detailed indices. It covers political, economic, social, and cultural developments for the period 323 B.C.E. to 150 B.C.E. and is only the first part of HENGEL's research, which he hopes will reach the first century C.E. The work contends that all Judaism, and not merely in the Diaspora, from the third century B.C.E. and not only from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, was under strong Hellenistic influence. TCHERIKOVER (927), whom, together with BICKERMANN, he generally follows, had argued that the reforms of the high priest Jason in the middle of the second century B.C.E. had not had much effect upon traditional Jewish life; but HENGEL, combining the evidence of literature and of the artistic findings discussed at such length by GOODENOUGH (928), contends that the impact was profound. According to HENGEL, even the concern of the Hasidim with understanding the cosmos has Hellenistic origins. He is certain, though the point is curiously neglected by Josephus, of Hellenistic influence on the Essenes. The organization of the sect at Qumran, he claims, has close analogies with contemporary Greek communal organization. Pharisaic thought has close parallels in Greek thought and in Philo, he asserts. Unfortunately, we may comment, our extant writings for the third century B.C.E. are extremely meager and, for the period as a whole, including Josephus, are largely polemical; and the art of the period, like the alleged Hellenizations in the Talmud, may well show merely superficial and external rather than deep influence; on this matter LIEBERMAN (929) has justly stressed that Greek influence on the rabbis was in language and in terminology rather than in ideas.

In addition, HENGEL posits that because the non-Jewish cities of Palestine, particularly in Phoenicia and in sites such as Gadara, exhibit Greek influence, the same must have been true of the Jewish settlements, whereas, we may comment, both Josephus and the Talmud indicate that there was deep-seated conflict against and even disdain toward the non-Jewish cities. Again, he declares that since Alexandria was so easily accessible from Palestine, we may assume connections; and yet, we may reply, we hear amazingly little in Philo, Josephus, or the Talmud of contact between the two. From the Greek inscriptions found in Palestine and from the fact that seventy-two elders in the third century B.C.E. knew enough Greek to be able to translate the Torah into that language, he concludes that knowledge of Greek was extensive. Yet Josephus (Ant. 20. 264) states that few born Jews had mastered the languages of other



nations, and it is clear from the fact that Josephus himself needed assistants for the sake of the Greek version of the 'War' that few had attained mastery of the language. Again, HENGEL says that the Talmudic curse (Baba Kamma 82b, Sotah 49b, Menaḥoth 64b) upon those who instruct their sons in Greek wisdom goes back to Antiochus Epiphanes and indicates that before that time Greek wisdom was studied; but the context of the three Talmudic passages is the civil war between Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II in 65 B.C.E., and the parallel in Josephus (Ant. 14. 25–28), while differing in a number of details, agrees in referring the incident to the same civil war.

Moreover, HENGEL deliberately restricts himself to the land of Israel, even though, by his own admission, Judaism there was already by the third century B.C.E. the center of the Diaspora, so to speak; hence it would seem artificial to separate them. Finally, his thesis depends for its validity on a strict concern for chronology; yet he uses Qumran texts, which date at the earliest from the Maccabean period, and the Talmud to establish Hellenization in the pre-Maccabean period. But even if HENGEL's conclusions may be challenged, the work will remain an extremely thorough collection of the sources. The second edition corrects some errors of the first edition and adds a supplemental bibliography, as well as additional references in footnotes.

WALSER (930) examines two particular items of commercial life, the trade in wines and aromatics, and is especially concerned with the question as to the extent to which the Jews borrowed the forms or substance of Hellenistic culture. But the dissertation shows, we must say, little comprehension of the use of archaeological evidence and of the integration of the evidence with literary sources. It is hardly aware of present-day developments in Hellenistic history and of the methodology of socio-economic history.

BRIEND (931) presents a very brief historical and religious survey.

SCHALIT (932), in a work intended for intelligent laymen, has five chapters by TCHERIKOVER on the first half of the period which add little to the latter's 'Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews' (927) and which, in fact, lack that work's detailed critical analysis of sources and of major problems. AVI-YONAH's chapter, pp. 147–182, on the wars of Judah Maccabee is an English version of his article in the Lewy Memorial volume (933). There is no adequate treatment in this work of the political and religious background of these events. KLAUSNER has four chapters, betraying his prejudices in favor of nationalism, on the Hasmonean dynasty. These chapters should have been updated in view of the work by HENGEL and others on Hellenization, the sects, and rabbinic trends. SCHALIT himself has a stimulating chapter on the political basis of Hasmonean leadership, but he has little on internal affairs. There is little attempt to co-ordinate the contributions of the various authors; and there are, in fact, blatant contradictions. Finally, there is hardly any effort to modify views in the light of the continuing discoveries of archaeology.

FINEGAN (933a), pp. 253–263, has a brief, uncritical summary of Palestine under the Hasmoneans (168–63 B.C.E.) and under the Herodians and Romans (63 B.C.E.–70 C.E.).

I have not seen INOUE (933b).

GOLDIN (933c) presents a popular survey of the political, religious, economic, and social history of the Jews. It is largely dependent upon Josephus but is critical of him on the ground that he was writing for a Hellenistic audience, and emphasizes social and economic trends.

GRANT (933d), pp. 254–283, has a political and religious history of this period.

SCHNEIDER (933e), pp. 864–901, surveys Hellenistic culture and Judaism.

STERN (933f), has a careful, systematic survey.

TAMARI (933g), in checking on the validity of Talmudic sources for history, often cites Josephus. He is heavily dependent upon the works of his mentor, SOLOMON ZEITLIN.

MOMIGLIANO (933h), in a series of popular but critical lectures, deals (pp. 74–96) with the Hellenistic discovery of Judaism and (pp. 97–122) with the Greeks, Jews, and Romans from Antiochus III to Pompey. [See *infra*, p. 912.]

I have not seen VARSAT (933i).

HENGEL (933j), in a work derived in part from his 'Judentum und Hellenismus' and in part further developed from this work, deals with the political and social history of Palestine from Alexander to Antiochus III; various aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the early Hellenistic period; the struggle over the political and social status of Greeks, barbarians, and Jews; Hellenization as a literary, philosophical, linguistic, and religious problem; and the meeting of Judaism and Hellenism in Palestine and in the Diaspora. HENGEL, after co-ordinating the archaeological and literary evidence, concludes by minimizing the differences between Palestine and the Diaspora so far as Hellenization is concerned. In that case, we may ask, why was there so little communication between the Diaspora and Judaea, if they both shared similar outlooks? HENGEL, moreover, unfortunately sees Hellenistic Judaism as a preparation for Christianity instead of as a movement in its own right. An abridged version in English is to appear as two chapters in the forthcoming 'Cambridge History of Judaism'.

I (933k) have criticized HENGEL for advancing the date of Hellenism's inroads on Palestinian Judaism, noting that there is no evidence of Palestinian Jewish mercenaries in Greek and Macedonian armies; the attitude of Jews toward non-Jews in Palestine, to judge from Josephus, was one of conflict and even of disdain; while it is true that the names of the *gerousia* and of the Sanhedrin were borrowed from the Greek, whether much more than the name was borrowed has not yet been proven; the positive attitude of the Jews toward foreign states was merely a pragmatic one; Greek commercial influence may be seen on the wealthier Jews but hardly on the masses; though many Jews had a smattering of Greek, Josephus (Ant. 20. 264) remarks that the Jews do not favor those who master many languages; though there are a number of similarities between the words in Homer and in the Bible, these reflect primarily commercial contacts, presumably in the Mycenaean period; the fact that the Phoenicians in the third century B.C.E. adopted Greek names does not mean that the Jews did so; though Alexandria is geographically close to Palestine, we hear amazingly little in Philo, Josephus, or the Talmud of contact between the two; we may suggest that the theory of a connection between Jews and Spartans came about

through the fact that the mythical founder of Thebes, Cadmus, was a Semite who came from Phoenicia and who sowed a serpent's teeth in the ground, from which sprang the *Spartoi* ("sown men"); the mention in the Mishnah of the books of Homer, even if our reading is correct, does not show that the books were known before 175 B.C.E.; since it is clear from the Talmud, Josephus, and the New Testament that Jews avoided contact with the Samaritans, it is hardly likely that the anonymous Samaritan, pseudo-Eupolemus, who wrote in Greek, influenced them; to say that the Jewish historian Eupolemus wrote in Palestine because his Greek was deficient is to assume that every Alexandrian Jew wrote Greek as well as Philo; Jason of Cyrene wrote not in Palestine but in Alexandria or Antioch; while, no doubt, at the time of the Septuagint (270 B.C.E.), some Palestinian Jews knew Greek, the question is how many and how well; the erotic motifs in certain books of the Bible and of the Apocrypha are not necessarily due to Greek influence, since they are found in Egyptian and Persian sources also; the question of theodicy in Ecclesiastes need not go back to the Greeks, since it is found in Job; various allegedly Stoic motifs (such as the purposefulness of individual phenomena and ethical ideas) in Ben Sira need not be due to Greek influence but may go back to the Bible itself; the alleged phrases exhibiting influence of the Stoics on rabbinic literature may more readily be explained as commonplaces; motifs in Daniel, such as the watcher-angels or the four kingdoms, need not go back to Hesiod, since Hesiod himself was probably dependent upon Near Eastern sources; the picture of the Lower World in I Enoch hardly illustrates HENGEL's theory, since the book was written between 163 and 63 B.C.E. and not prior to the Hasmonean period; the parallels between Essene and Greek ideas are irrelevant, since HENGEL himself dates the origin of the Essenes at about 150 B.C.E.

SANDMEL (933l) similarly rejects HENGEL's theory, noting that the Book of Chronicles already contains aspects of what HENGEL calls Hellenistic ideas and yet predates the Hellenistic period.

MILLAR (933m), while noting HENGEL's immense learning, criticizes his thesis as that of a Christian theologian, since HENGEL views the early Hellenistic period as one when Hellenism and Judaism reached an accommodation, only to be halted by the reactionary Hasmoneans, but revived and brought to complete fulfillment by Christianity. MILLAR argues that the evidence shows how un-Greek the Jewish community remained down to the second century B.C.E.

SCHÄFER (933n), pp. 544–545, gives an uncritical survey of Josephus and especially of his sources.

MATTHIAE (933o) has a 'synchronoptic' chart of important political leaders and events from 180 B.C.E. to 140 C.E. both in Palestine and in the Diaspora.

VERMES (933p), pp. 138–142, has a brief summary of Jewish history from 200 B.C.E. to 70 C.E.

I (933q) frequently cite Josephus, who is the source of so many of the fragments of Greek and Latin authors pertaining to the Jews, while discussing the nature and extent of this evidence, pagan knowledge of the geography of the land of Israel, pagan knowledge of Biblical history, pagan knowledge of Jewish beliefs and practices, and the alleged vices of the Jews.

AVI-YONAH (933r), in a popular, lavishly illustrated book which co-ordinates archaeological finds and coins with Josephus, stresses the deep intrusion of Hellenistic culture into Palestine, especially the cities, but also the countryside, long before Antiochus Epiphanes.

WHITELOCKE (933s), in a book largely based on Josephus and written for young seminarians, surveys the political and religious history of the Jews in the Graeco-Roman period.

JAY (933t), in the first part of his work, surveys the political history of Palestine during the Hellenistic-Roman period.

I have not seen DUVENAGE (933u), written in Afrikaans, which, according to the summary in 'New Testament Abstracts', treats the New Testament world in six major chapters: the Graeco-Roman world from Alexander the Great to the first century C.E., the history of Judaism in the period of the Second Temple, the land and people of Palestine in the time of the New Testament, Jewish political life in the New Testament, Jewish religious life in the New Testament, and Judaism in the Diaspora.

JOHNSON (933v), in a popular work which co-ordinates Josephus and archaeology, surveys (pp. 87–107) the history of the conflict between the Greeks and the Maccabees and (pp. 109–141) the age of Herod. He uses Josephus, whom he calls a moderate Jew, uncritically, though he admits that Josephus' account is suspect.

KIPPENBERG and WEWERS (933w) have an anthology of translations (with brief introductions) into German of texts relating to the political and economic history of Judaea in the Hellenistic-Roman period.

I have not seen FREYNE (933x),

## 12: Josephus as Historian of the Post-Biblical Period: Specific Events

### 12.0: Josephus on Alexander the Great

- (934) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 6, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books IX–XI (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1937.
- (935) JOSHUA GUTMANN: Alexander of Macedonia in Palestine (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 11, 1940, pp. 271–294.
- (936) MORTON SMITH: *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament*. New York 1971.
- (937) ISRAEL ABRAHAMS: *Campaigns in Palestine from Alexander the Great*. Oxford 1927. Rpt. Chicago 1967.
- (938) MARCEL SIMON: Un aspect judéo-chrétien de la légende d'Alexandre. In: *Actes du Congrès G. Budé à Strasbourg 20–22 Avril 1938*. Paris 1939. Pp. 208–209.
- (939) MARCEL SIMON: Alexandre le Grand, juif et chrétien. In: *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 21, 1941, pp. 177–191.
- (940) WITOLD DZIĘCIOL: Józef Flawiusz jako historyk Aleksandra. In: *Aleksander Wielki Macedonski*. London 1963. Pp. 205–212.
- (940a) FRIEDRICH PFISTER: Alexander der Große in den Offenbarungen der Griechen, Juden, Mohammedaner und Christen (*Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft*, 3). Berlin 1956. Reprinted in his: *Kleine Schriften*. Meisenheim 1976. Pp. 301–347.
- (940b) C. H. R. MARTIN: Alexander and the High Priest. In: *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society* 23, 1969–70, pp. 102–114.
- (940c) B. A. MASTIN: Daniel 2.46 and the Hellenistic World. In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 85, 1973, pp. 80–93.
- (940d) ARYEH KASHER: Some Suggestions and Comments Concerning Alexander Macedon's Campaign in Palestine (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 20, 1975, pp. 187–208.

MARCUS (934), pp. 512–532, has a selective bibliography, together with a careful, if unoriginal, evaluation of the primary evidence, including the Talmud, and the more important items in the sizable scholarly literature on Alexander and the Jews (*Antiquities* 11. 317–345). His suspicion of the credibility of Josephus account is rightly maintained by GUTMANN (935) and by SMITH (936), p. 264, n. 25.

ABRAHAMS (937), pp. 7–12, has a military analysis of Alexander's campaigns in Palestine. He concludes that Josephus is probably right in having Alexander and Jaddaeus the high priest meet north of Jerusalem.

SIMON (938) traces the development of the Jewish and Christian legend which claimed that Alexander had accepted the Jewish G-d as his own. The same view is developed more fully in a later article by SIMON (939).

I have been unable to read DZIĘCIOL (940), who has a discussion of Josephus as an historian of Alexander.

PFISTER (940a), in an updating of his work originally published in 1914, concludes that the accounts of Josephus and of the Talmud on Alexander and the Jews go back to a common late Hellenistic-Jewish source. He notes that Alexander was firmly anchored in the religious writings of the Jews, as we can see from Josephus' comparison of Alexander's miraculous crossing of the Pamphylian Sea and Moses' crossing of the Red Sea (Ant. 2. 348).

MARTIN (940b) presents an English translation of the Second Chronicle of the Samaritans on the meeting of Alexander with Hezekiah, the high priest of the Samaritans, and notes that Josephus (Ant. 11. 329–339) has an extraordinarily similar account, except that for 'Samaritans' Josephus reads 'Jews', and that for 'Shechem' he reads 'Jerusalem'. He concludes that it is unlikely that Alexander bothered to visit either Jerusalem or Shechem, that if he did visit one or both it was on his return from Egypt and not before going there, and that the Samaritan chronicler has no more than a polemical purpose. We may, however, comment that the fact that such remarkably parallel stories are found in both Josephus and in that of the Jewish arch-enemies indicates that they may contain a common kernel of truth.

MASTIN (940c), pp. 87–89, cites the parallel in Josephus (Ant. 11. 331–335) between Alexander and Nebuchadnezzar, noting that in both cases an expression of gratitude is linked with a dream which reveals the future.

KASHER (940d) argues that Josephus' portrayal of Alexander is not so untrustworthy as has been judged by modern scholars. Josephus is credible because there is evidence that the conquest of Syria and Palestine was carried out through a well-planned military scheme and was not a trifling matter for Alexander. The presence of Macedonian forces in Transjordan is proved by local traditions of some Hellenistic cities. One of the most important missions which was imposed upon Parmenio, Alexander's highest ranking officer, was the conquest of Syria and Palestine, presumably to acquire food with which to support the main army which was engaged in the long siege of Tyre. KASHER argues that Alexander did not leave for Egypt immediately after the conquest of Gaza and that he thus had enough time to pay a visit to Jerusalem.

### 12.1: Josephus' Version of the 'Letter of Aristeas'

(941) ANTONIUS VAN DALE: *Dissertatio super Aristeia*. Amsterdam 1705.

(942) ADOLF WILHELM: Zu dem Judenerlasse des Ptolemaios Philadelphos. In: *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* 14, 1941, pp. 30–35.

(943) MOSES HADAS, ed. and trans.: *Aristeas to Philocrates (Letter of Aristeas)*. New York 1951.

(944) HEINRICH KARPP: 'Prophet' oder 'Dolmetscher'? Die Geltung der Septuaginta in der Alten Kirche. In: WILHELM SCHNEEMELCHER, ed., *Festschrift Günther Dehn*. Neukirchen 1957. Pp. 103–117.

(945) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate (Sources Chrétiennes, 89)*. Paris 1962.

- (946) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: *Flavius Josèphe, Adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristée. Une réaction atticisme contre la koinè* (Études et Commentaires, 45). Paris 1962.
- (947) EDUARD NORDEN: *Die Antike Kunstprosa*. 2 vols. Leipzig 1898.
- (948) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG, rev.: ANDRÉ PELLETIER, *Flavius Josèphe, Adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristée*. In: *Gnomon* 36, 1964, pp. 562–572.
- (949) MOSES HADAS, rev.: ANDRÉ PELLETIER, *Flavius Josèphe, Adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristée*. In: *American Journal of Philology* 85, 1964, pp. 441–443.
- (949a) LÉON HERRMANN: *La Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate et l'empereur Titus*. In: *Latomus* 25, 1966, pp. 58–77.
- (949b) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Notes on the Letter of Aristeeas*. In: *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, 10, Athens, Georgia 1977, pp. 22–30.
- (949c) JOHN L. WHITE: *Royal Correspondence in Pseudo-Aristeeas and the Parallel Letters in Josephus and Eusebius*. Summary in: *Abstracts, Society of Biblical Literature*, ed. PAUL J. ACHEMEIER. Missoula, Montana 1979. P. 26.
- (949d) NORBERT MEISNER: *Untersuchungen zum Aristeeasbrief*. 2 vols. Diss., D. Th., Kirchlichen Hochschule, Berlin 1960.
- (949e) JAMES-G. FÉVRIER: *La date, la composition et les sources de la Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences Historiques et Philologiques, 242). Paris 1924.

VAN DALE (941), pp. 40–53, in a pioneer work, compares Josephus and the 'Letter of Aristeeas', noting his omissions and variations and commenting on Josephus' credibility as a writer. He concludes that Josephus' modifications are due to his pandering to Gentile tastes.

WILHELM (942) appropriately cites the parallel of Antiquities 12. 29 for the reading and interpretation of Aristeeas 23.

HADAS (943), pp. 18–21, commenting on Josephus' use of the 'Letter of Aristeeas', concludes that Aristeeas 83–171, though not in Josephus' paraphrase and though not mentioned by him as omitted, as other passages are, is not an interpolation. Noting the divergences of Josephus from 'Aristeeas', HADAS concludes that Josephus' purpose was to render the account inoffensive and more credible to non-Jews; but to say that 'Aristeeas' was addressing himself to the Jewish community whereas Josephus was writing for the Gentile world is, we may comment, to disregard the vast Greek-speaking Jewish audience in whose hands Josephus' works also fell.

KARPP (944) traces the attitude to the Septuagint from Philo, who viewed the translators as hierophants and prophets (*De Vita Mosis* 2. 36–44), and Josephus, who is more sober (*Ant.* 12. 104–109), to the Church Fathers, who generally followed Philo rather than Josephus in this matter. KARPP fails to realize, however, that what may have influenced Josephus is the rabbinic attitude, which at first (*Megillah* 9a) regarded the translators as divinely inspired but later (*Soferim* 1. 7) had second thoughts.

PELLETIER (945) has a critical edition of the 'Letter' which he complements with a commentary (946) on Josephus' version (*Ant.* 12. 12–118), which he prints synoptically in parallel columns with the 'Letter'. In particular, he stresses Josephus' vocabulary, grammar, word order, metrical clausulae, and prose rhythms. This is especially valuable because this passage in Josephus is one of the few places where we definitely know Josephus' source and see precisely

what Josephus does with it and can gain an indication of the Greek that was taught in Roman schools of rhetoric at the end of the first century, in particular the Atticizing reaction against the *koinē*. PELLETIER notes, in particular, Josephus' predilection for Stoic terminology in his choice of vocabulary. On the basis of the fact that Josephus here modifies his source stylistically without falsifying it, PELLETIER concludes that Josephus elsewhere also is reliable; but this may be, we here suggest, because Josephus' source was already sufficiently apologetic for his purposes. Valuable as PELLETIER's work is, it has a number of flaws. First of all, errata are extremely numerous, and the book is repetitious in style. Secondly, in his consideration of clausulae, PELLETIER is unacquainted with anything written after NORDEN (947). Again, SCHRECKENBERG (948) deservedly criticizes him for omitting consideration of Josephus' Hellenistic precedents. Finally, HADAS (949) notes that more light might have been thrown on Josephus' Atticizing by reference to the rhetoricians Theon's and especially Hermogenes' prescriptions as to the proper method of introducing citations and allusions.

HERRMANN (949a), p. 73, comments on Josephus' refashioning of the 'Letter of Aristeas' for propaganda purposes in the light of his abridging and re-modeling official documents, such as royal or high priestly letters.

SHUTT (949b) concludes that Josephus, though the 'Letter of Aristeas' was the only source for his version of how the Septuagint was produced, did not use it slavishly.

WHITE (949c) compares three Jewish letters (including the 'Letter of Aristeas'), written in Greek and which claim to have been composed during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus in the third century B.C.E., with contemporaneous letters written on papyrus or inscribed on stone in order to determine the original form and the approximate origin of the letters. He examines the opening and closing formulae to see whether they have been abbreviated, as in some Greek letters of the period, as a result of being quoted within another document.

MEISNER (949d), pp. 218–230, objects to the theory of FÉVRIER (949e) that Josephus employed an abridged version of Aristeas.

## 12.2: Early Seleucid History

- (950) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (951) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 7, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XII–XIV (Loeb Classical Library). London 1943.
- (952) GEORGE M. HADDAD: Aspects of Social Life in Antioch in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. Diss., Ph. D., University of Chicago 1950 (printed, New York 1949).
- (953) CARL H. KRAELING: The Jewish Community at Antioch. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51, 1932, pp. 130–160.
- (954) FRANÇOIS BLANCHETIÈRE: Juifs et non-Juifs. Essai sur la diaspora en Asie-Mineure. In: *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses* 54, 1974, pp. 367–382.
- (955) GLANVILLE DOWNEY: A History of Antioch in Syria, from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest. Princeton 1961.



- (956) PHILIP K. HITTI: *History of Syria: including Lebanon and Palestine*. London 1951; 2nd ed., thoroughly revised, London 1957.
- (957) PHILIP K. HITTI: *Lebanon in History from the Earliest Times to the Present*. London 1957, 1962, 1967.
- (958) CHARLES EDSON: *Imperium Macedonicum: The Seleucid Empire and the Literary Evidence*. In: *Classical Philology* 53, 1958, pp. 153–170.

SCHALIT (950), p. 259, is justly critical of Josephus for giving such scant attention to the events preceding Antiochus III's conquest of the land of Israel and for ignoring the developments in Judaea on the eve of that conquest, which, we may suggest, must have been of some importance to produce the religious and cultural outburst that followed. In this respect Josephus is far inferior to the third-century C.E. Porphyry, who greatly influenced Jerome's commentary on Daniel.

MARCUS (951), pp. 737–742, in his discussion of the scholarly literature on this period, casts doubt on the credibility of Josephus' claim (Ant. 12. 119–127) that Seleucus I Nicator (who ruled from 312 to 281 B.C.E.), the founder of the Seleucid empire, and Antiochus II Theos granted citizenship to the Syrian Jews.

HADDAD (952), pp. 59–65, commenting on the Jews of Antioch, contents himself for the most part with a mere summary of the views of KRAELING (953) and MARCUS (951). As to Josephus' statement (Against Apion 2. 39) that the Jews of Antioch were granted citizenship by Seleucus I, HADDAD, pp. 50–51, says that such a claim was written in an apologetic spirit and is contradicted by Josephus' statement (War 7. 43) in which there is no mention of these old privileges but only of the privileges granted to them by Antiochus Epiphanes' successors. But, we may reply, Josephus in the 'Antiquities' (12. 119) also specifies that it was Seleucus I who granted them citizenship; and the passage in the 'War', if read carefully, speaks of the restoration of votive offerings to the Jews of Antioch and implies that citizenship was similarly restored and not granted for the first time.

BLANCHETIÈRE (954) admits that there are historical problems concerning the alleged grant of citizenship by Seleucus Nicator (Ant. 12. 119), but that at any rate by 204–201 B.C.E. the Jews were being settled in Phrygia and Lydia (Ant. 12. 147–153), their increased presence being due to voluntary settlement, deportation, and colonization. He concludes that it is likely that there were religious contests between Judaea and Asia Minor even before Alexander's conquest. The Jews of Asia Minor, he argues, were more positively disposed to Hellenism than Jews elsewhere, were very active in attracting proselytes and 'sympathizers' to Judaism, and even influenced such pagan cults as that of Sabazius. This, we may comment, seems reasonable enough, though we do not have a Jewish writer, such as Philo, from Asia Minor, nor do we have any sizable number of inscriptions from this period.

DOWNY (955), who also draws heavily on KRAELING (953), depends greatly on Josephus; see especially pp. 107–111 on the city of Antioch in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes.

HITTI (956), pp. 319–320, notes that our principal authority for the history of Syria during the Hellenistic and early Roman period is Josephus,

whose account, he says, is colored by his desire to gratify his imperial patrons. Here and in his book on Lebanon (957) HIRTI is, nevertheless, uncritical of Josephus.

EDSON (958) cites a number of passages in Josephus (Ant. 12. 322, etc.) in support of his contention that the Seleucid Empire was viewed as Macedonian in character.

### 12.3: Antiochus III

- (959) EDUARD MEYER: *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*. Vol. 2. Stuttgart 1921.
- (960) EUGENE [sic] TAEUBLER: Jerusalem 201 to 199 B.C.E.: On the History of a Messianic Movement. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 37, 1946–47, pp.1–30, 125–137, 249–263.
- (961) ALBRECHT ALT: Zu Antiochus' III. Erlaß für Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. XII 3, 3 §§ 138–144). In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 16, 1939, pp. 283–285.
- (962) ELIAS BICKERMANN: La Charte Séleucide de Jérusalem. In: *Revue des Études juives* 100, 1935, pp. 4–35. Translated into German by GÜNTER MAYER in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, *Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84)*. Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 205–240.
- (963) ELIAS BIKERMAN [sic]: Une question d'authenticité: Les privilèges juifs. In: *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales de l'Université Libre de Bruxelles* 13, 1953 (= *Mélanges Isidore Lévy*), pp. 11–34.
- (964) RALPH MARCUS: Appendix D: Antiochus III and the Jews (Ant. 12. 129–153). In: Josephus, vol. 7, *Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV* (Loeb Classical Library). London 1943. Pp. 743–766.
- (965) AVIGDOR TSCHERIKOWER (VICTOR TCHERIKOVER): *The Jews and the Greeks in the Hellenistic Age* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1930. Trans. into English by SHIMON APPLEBAUM: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959.
- (966) A. MITTWOCH: Tribute and Land-Tax in Seleucid Judaea. In: *Biblica* 36, 1955, pp. 352–361.
- (967) ÉLIE BIKERMAN [sic]: Une proclamation séleucide relative au temple de Jérusalem. In: *Syria* 25, 1946–48, pp. 67–85.
- (968) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: The Letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis Regarding the Establishment of Jewish Military Colonies in Phrygia and Lydia. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 50, 1959–60, pp. 289–318. Trans. into German by JAKOB MITTELMANN in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, *Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84)*. Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 337–366.
- (968a) THEOPHIL MIDDENDORF: *Die Stellung Jesu ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus*. Leiden 1973.
- (968b) JÖRG-DIETER GAUGER: *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik. Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im I. Makkabäerbuch*. Diss., Bonn 1975. Published: Köln-Bonn 1977.
- (968c) GETZEL M. COHEN: *The Seleucid Colonies: Studies in Founding, Administration and Organization* (Historia, Einzelschriften, Heft 30). Wiesbaden 1978.
- (968d) JAMES E. TAYLOR: *Seleucid Rule in Palestine*. Diss., Ph. D., Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 1979. Microfilm: Ann Arbor 1981.
- (968e) ALF THOMAS KRAABEL: Paganism and Judaism: The Sardis Evidence. In: *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*. Paris 1978. Pp. 13–33.

MEYER (959), p. 122, severely criticizes Josephus for his treatment of the early Hellenistic period.

TAEUBLER (960) admits that Josephus (Ant. 12. 131) erred in stating that Antiochus III defeated Ptolemy IX (in 204 B.C.E.) and that, as a result, Judaea was incorporated into the Seleucid empire, when actually the victory consisted of the conquest of Gaza and occurred in the reign of Ptolemy V. Otherwise, however, TAEUBLER defends Josephus, asserting that his errors are due to his sources; but, we may ask, is not one of the prime tasks of a good historian to choose his sources carefully and to evaluate them critically?

ALT (961), following through on a suggestion by BICKERMANN (962), p. 12, rightly declares that the probability of forgery of the documents quoted in Antiquities 12. 138–144 is not great.

Elsewhere BICKERMANN (963), by a minute study of the formulae and chronological order of the decrees cited by Josephus (Ant. 12. 138–153), carefully concludes that they are authentic; somewhat weaker is his argument that this conclusion is reinforced by the facts that they often contradict Josephus, that they do not form an integral part of the narrative, and that hence there would have to be several Jewish forgers who made their falsifications on isolated sheets of papyrus.

MARCUS (964) presents an especially helpful discussion of the scholarly literature, notably the works by TCHERIKOVER (965) and BICKERMANN (962), on the genuineness and accuracy of the three documents containing the privileges granted by Antiochus III to the Jews (Ant. 12. 138–153). MARCUS praises BICKERMANN's careful study and follows him in accepting their authenticity. TAEUBLER (960) is, however, critical of BICKERMANN on the ground that the restoration of the city is not mentioned at all in Antiochus' letter, nor is the return of those who had taken to flight promulgated as a permission or injunction, though he finds the contents of the letter confirmed in Psalms and Ben Sira in far-fetched references.

TCHERIKOVER (965) comments on the relative silence of Josephus concerning the events between the end of the Biblical period and the Maccabean uprising. The usual explanation for this is that Josephus' sources were apparently particularly scanty for this period; an additional reason, we may suggest, is that the period was perhaps one in which the Jews achieved little of greatness to compare with their previous and later achievements; and in an apologetic work Josephus was not eager to display this fact.

MITTWOCH (966) asserts that the statement in the letter of Antiochus III (Ant. 12. 144) relieving the Jews of the payment of a third of their tribute so as to compensate for their past losses distorts the facts though it contains a kernel of truth. The payment of tribute, she asserts, exempted a community from the land-tax. This tax was imposed, as Josephus shows, by Antiochus Epiphanes and his successors as a result of Jason's revolt and the subsequent Maccabean uprising.

BICKERMANN (967) presents the text and French translation of and an extensive, largely rabbinic, commentary on Antiquities 12. 145–146, which quotes an edict of Antiochus III designed to preserve the purity of Jerusalem.

Elsewhere, SCHALIT (968), on the basis of a careful analysis of the structure, style, and especially the content of the letter quoted in Antiquities 12. 148–153, concludes that it is genuine. SCHALIT here has a fine discussion of the Jewish military colonies founded at the end of the third century B.C.E.

MIDDENDORP (968a), p. 168, agrees with TSCHERIKOWER (965) in seeing a connection between the letter of Antiochus III (Ant. 12. 138–144) and the building program of the high priest Simon the Just.

GAUGER (968b), commenting on Antiochus III's letter to Zeuxis (Ant. 12. 147–153), states that Josephus changes the documentary material before him in form but not in content. On the basis of a thorough examination of the historical references, terminology, content, and form, and on the basis of a comparison with III Esdras, Esther, Pseudo-Aristeas, and I Maccabees, he concludes that the letter is not authentic. Josephus, he says, did not take the documents from a Greek source such as Polybius, but rather from a Jewish or another barbarian source, perhaps containing a collection of documents. He suggests that the documents may have been falsified in the context of the disputes that began between the Jews and the Greeks in Asia Minor in the middle of the first century B.C.E.

COHEN (968c), pp. 5–9, commenting on the letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis (Ant. 12. 147–153), asserts that the choice of Mesopotamian Jews by King Antiochus III to colonize Asia Minor was prompted by their effectiveness as soldiers and by their loyalty. He concludes that despite the fact that the king's letter never says so explicitly, the colonists were soldiers, and that the word *χεῖρα* near the end of the letter refers to military service. We may comment that the facts that the Jews were transported there after a local revolt, that they were brought to fortresses, and that they are termed “guards (*φύλακας*) of our interests” all support Cohen's view.

TAYLOR (968d) concentrates on the Seleucid conquest of Palestine and on its civil and economic administration from 200 to 162 B.C.E. In particular, he analyzes an inscription found in 1960 near Beth Shean (Scythopolis) containing letters exchanged between Antiochus III and Ptolemy the *strategos* and others, and a letter of Antiochus III to Ptolemy the *strategos* concerning Jerusalem quoted by Josephus (Ant. 12. 138–144). TAYLOR argues that the policy of the Egyptian Ptolemies toward the Jews of Jerusalem was the chief factor in influencing the high priest to favor Antiochus, who, in turn, rewarded him and his followers. It is the nature of these rewards and their implication for Seleucid taxation that has been much misinterpreted. TAYLOR's analysis, we may comment, seems plausible in view of the fact that the high priests were so much involved in political and economic affairs.

KRAABEL (968e), pp. 14–18, follows TSCHERIKOWER (965), pp. 287–288, in regarding Antiquities 12. 147–153, containing Antiochus III's letter to Zeuxis, the governor of Lydia, as genuine evidence that Jews were settled in Lydia and Phrygia as a means of pacifying the land. He regards it as quite probable that at least some of these pro-Seleucid Jews made their homes in Zeuxis' Seleucid capital.

## 12.4: The Tobiads

- (969) RALPH MARCUS: *Selected Literature on the Oniads and Tobiads and Palestine under Ptolemaic Rule* (Ant. xii. 154–236). Appendix E. In: Josephus, vol. 7, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XII–XIV (Loeb Classical Library). London 1943. Pp. 767–768.
- (970) GEORGE M. HARPER: *A Study in the Commercial Relations between Egypt and Syria in the Third Century before Christ*. In: *American Journal of Philology* 49, 1928, pp. 1–35.
- (971) ELIAS BICKERMAN (BICKERMANN): *Institutions des Séleucides*. Paris 1938.
- (972) SOLOMON GANDZ: *The Hall of Reckonings in Jerusalem*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 31, 1940–41, pp. 383–404.
- (973) MICHAEL ROSTOVITZ: *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. 3 vols. Oxford 1941.
- (974) BENJAMIN MAZAR (MAISLER): *The House of Tobiah* (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 12, 1940–41, pp. 109–123.
- (975) BENJAMIN MAZAR (MAISLER): *Ben Tab'al and the House of Tobiah* (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 4, 1956, pp. 249–251.
- (976) BENJAMIN MAZAR (MAISLER): *The Tobiads*. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 7, 1957, pp. 137–145, 229–238.
- (977) CHESTER C. McCOWN: *The 'Araq el-Emir and the Tobiads*. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 20, 1957, pp. 63–76.
- (978) PAUL W. LAPP: *The Second and Third Campaigns at 'Arâq el-Emîr*. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 171, 1963, pp. 8–39.
- (979) DOROTHY K. HILL: *The Animal Fountain of 'Arâq el-Emîr*. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 171, 1963, pp. 45–55.
- (980) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER and ALEXANDER FUKS, edd.: *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass. 1957. Pp. 115–130.
- (981) AVIGDOR TSCHERIKOWER (VICTOR TCHERIKOVER): *The Jews and the Greeks in the Hellenistic Age* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1930. Trans. into English by SHIMON APPLEBAUM: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959.
- (982) MENAHEM STERN: *Notes on the Story of Joseph the Tobiad* (Josephus, *Antiquities* XII, 154ff.) (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 32, 1962–63, pp. 35–47.
- (983) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: *The Tales of the Tobiads*. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, Part 3: *Judaism before 70* (*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 12, part 3). Leiden 1975. Pp. 85–123.
- (983a) CLAIRE PRÉAUX: *L'économie royale des Lagides*. Bruxelles 1939.
- (983b) YEHOShUA GUTTMANN and MENAHEM STERN: *From the Babylonian Exile to the Bar Kochba Revolt*. In: DAVID BEN-GURION, ed., *The Jews in Their Land*. London 1966. Pp. 104–163.
- (983c) (JAN) W(ILLEM) DOEVE: *Le domaine du temple de Jérusalem*. In: *Recherches bibliques* 9 (ed. WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK), London 1974, pp. 118–163.
- (983d) ROGER S. BAGNALL: *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt* (*Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition*, 4). Leiden 1976 (revised version of thesis, University of Toronto).

MARCUS (969) presents a fine selective bibliography on the early Ptolemies.

HARPER (970), pp. 9–12, discusses the correspondences and inconsistencies between Josephus' account of Joseph the son of Tobias (Ant. 12. 160–236) and archaeological and papyrological evidence.

BICKERMANN (971) notes that Josephus alone affirms that Antiochus III of Syria transferred to Ptolemy Epiphanes the entire contested portion of Palestine

(Ant. 12. 154). This is an error, he says, due to Josephus' source, a history of Joseph the son of Tobias; and BICKERMANN follows the evidence of Polybius.

GANDZ (1972) suggests that Joseph the son of Tobias established a λογιστήριον in Jerusalem in imitation of the Alexandrian model for the orderly management of the public tax revenue in the third century B.C.E. This, he says, is the meaning of Rabbi Johanan's reference to the Hall of Reckonings outside Jerusalem (Midrash 'Lamentations Rabbah' on 2. 15). But we may respond that this is a most unlikely interpretation of the Midrash, which says that whoever wanted to figure out some computations would have it done there, so that he might not leave Jerusalem worrying; hence the hall was a private, not a public, institution.

ROSTOVITZ (1973), vol. 1, p. 338, a master of the papyrological literature, concludes that several documents of the Zenon correspondence concerning Joseph the Tobiad (especially P. Cairo Zenon 59037) make it probable that the picture drawn by Josephus (Ant. 12. 169) of an auction of the provincial taxes of Lower Syria is, on the whole, accurate.

MAZAR (MAISLER) (1974)(1975)(1976) shows, on the basis of an inscription containing the name Tobiah, that the family goes back to 500 B.C.E. and not, as generally thought, to the third century B.C.E.

MCCOWN (1977) enthusiastically asserts that Josephus (Ant. 12. 228–233) describes the layout of Hyrcanus' fortress in Transjordan with such precision that it can be identified unmistakably as 'Araq el-Emîr; but, we may remark, Josephus' statement that Hyrcanus, Tobiah's grandson, built it can hardly be correct, since the Zenon papyri show that the fortress was in existence as early as the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

LAPP (1978) concludes from potsherds that any attempt to alter Josephus' date for the building excavated at the site known as Qasr el-'Abd is misguided. He asserts that Josephus is correct in attributing the work in the caves to Hyrcanus and that Josephus' account (Ant. 12. 228–234), in general, is surprisingly reliable.

HILL (1979) contends that Josephus' account of Hyrcanus the grandson of Tobias in Antiquities 12. 230 is confirmed by the archaeological finds. The fact that the Qasr el-'Abd remained unfinished is, she asserts, in accord with the story of the builder's suicide.

TCHERIKOVER and FUKS (1980), pp. 115–130, in their classic edition of the texts, together with translation, commentary, and bibliography for the papyri dealing with Jews, assert that the Zenon papyri confirm in high degree the Hellenization of Tobias, the father of Joseph, who, in one of his letters (no. 4) to the Egyptian minister Apollonius, actually uses the pagan formula "many thanks to the gods". The story of Joseph the son of Tobias is, however, according to TCHERIKOVER (1981), p. 166, full of "fictional tales and aggadic words".

STERN (1982), on the basis of a study of the language and style employed by Josephus, concludes that Josephus' source was not a Tobiad family chronicle but rather a work of the second or first century B.C.E. composed in Egypt and sympathetic to the Ptolemies and to Hyrcanus the son of Joseph the Tobiad. STERN dates the height of Joseph's career from 240 to 218 B.C.E.

GOLDSTEIN (1983) suggests that Josephus' source for his account of the Tobiads (Ant. 12. 158–236) is not a biography or a fictional romance but a propagandist who was pro-Ptolemaic and anti-Seleucid, namely Onias IV, the founder of the Jewish temple of Leontopolis, and who wrote some time between 131 and 129. This, he asserts, will explain the errors in Josephus' account, which attacked Onias' work in the manner of a nineteenth-century German scientific critic by removing 'distortions'. We may remark that there is no evidence that Onias IV wrote anything, that there is no evidence that Josephus attacked him in other parts of his work where we can check Josephus, that it seems unlikely that Josephus, a priest, would have used the work of a renegade priest as a major source even with corrections, and that GOLDSTEIN's theory presupposes much more independence on the part of Josephus than we see, for example, in his handling of I Maccabees. GOLDSTEIN concludes that, except for the exaggerated figure of the Ptolemaic revenues, the stories of Joseph and Hyrcanus are entirely true.

PRÉAUX (1983a), pp. 295–296, comments on Joseph the Tobiad (Ant. 12. 180ff.); and he notes (p. 456) that it is among 'royal friends' that the shrewd Joseph found the leaders to aid his enterprise.

GUTTMANN and STERN (1983b), p. 127, note that Josephus goes so far as to claim that Joseph son of Tobias changed the whole manner of Jewish life, erasing the poverty and degradation and creating a paradise in their place. The claim may be exaggerated, but it has some substance, since many Jews became wealthy as partners or as assistants in Tobiad affairs.

DOEVE (1983c), pp. 122–123, remarks that what Josephus tells about Joseph the Tobiad and his son Hyrcanus must have taken place in about twenty years, but that this appears impossible.

BAGNALL (1983d), pp. 20–21, comments on the Ptolemaic system of tax-farming, as seen in the account of Joseph the Tobiad (Ant. 12. 160–222).

## 12.5: The Relationship between the Jews and the Spartans

- (1984) MICHAEL S. GINSBURG: Sparta and Judaea. In: *Classical Philology* 29, 1934, pp. 117–122.
- (1985) FRANZ DORNSEIFF: Echtheitsfragen II: I. Sparta Bruder in Abraham. In: *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 1, 1946, pp. 128–132.
- (1986) S. SCHÜLLER: Some Problems Connected with the Supposed Common Ancestry of Jews and Spartans and Their Relations during the Last Three Centuries B.C. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1, 1956, p. 257–268.
- (1987) MOSES HADAS: *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion*. New York 1959. Trans. into German: *Hellenistische Kultur*. Stuttgart 1963.
- (1988) KLAUS D. SCHUNCK: *Die Quellen des I und II Makkabäerbuches*. Halle 1954.
- (1989) ANGELO PENNA: Διαθήκη ε συνθήκη nei libri dei Maccabei. In: *Biblica* 46, 1965, pp. 149–180.
- (1990) BURKHART CARDAUNS: Juden und Spartaner. Zur hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur. In: *Hermes* 95, 1967, pp. 317–324.
- (1991) WOLF WIRGIN: Judah Maccabee's Embassy to Rome and the Jewish-Roman Treaty. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 101, 1969, pp. 15–20.

- (991a) ALFRED R. C. LEANEY: Greek Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert (Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 44: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the occasion of his sixty-fifth birthday, ed. J. K. ELLIOTT). Leiden 1976. Pp. 283–300.

A number of scholars have been fascinated by the passages in I Maccabees 12. 21–23 and Antiquities 12. 225–227 and 13. 164–170 asserting ties of kinship between the Spartans and the Jews. GINSBURG (1984) suggests that it was Hecataeus of Abdera who told the Spartan king Areus that the Jews were related to the Spartans. He concludes that the historical background authorizes us to give credence to the account of diplomatic relations between Sparta and Judaea, but he does not even compare the account in Josephus with that of I Maccabees. We may here suggest, though with some diffidence, that the theory of a connection between Jews and Spartans may have come about through the fact that the founder of Thebes, Cadmus, whose very name is Semitic (from *kedem*, “east”) and who, indeed, is reported to have come to Thebes from Phoenicia, is said to have sown a serpent’s teeth in the ground, from which sprang armed men who were called Σπαρτοί, i.e. “sown men”. Though there is apparently no connection between σπαρτός, “sown”, and Σπάρτη, “Sparta”, the words are very similar, and folk etymologists may well have connected them, thus bringing Cadmus of Phoenicia into juxtaposition with Sparta; the next step would be to connect the Phoenicians’ neighbors, the Judeans, with Sparta.

DORNSEIFF (1985), commenting on Antiquities 12. 225, tries to account for the connection by noting that Amos 9. 7 derives the Philistines from Caphtor, which is generally identified with Crete; we may add that one of Tacitus’ theories of the origins of the Jews (Histories 5. 2) is that they came from Crete, as their name *Iudaei* (from Mount Ida on Creta, according to the theory) allegedly shows. Like GINSBURG, he suggests that Josephus’ source was Hecataeus, who was writing his ‘On Abraham’ at precisely this time.

SCHÜLLER (1986), who compares Antiquities 12. 226–227 with I Maccabees 12. 20–23, comments that Josephus was probably copying from I Maccabees but that he gave the letter of the Spartan king Areus a somewhat more Greek touch by omitting Hebraisms. He says that Josephus’ mention of the name of the messenger (Ant. 12. 277) and the description of the particular seal which was used strengthen the possibility of his having employed I Maccabees 12. 20–23 as a source or of his having seen a Hebrew copy of the original letter. The few facts which are known about Spartan foreign policy during Areus’ reign tend, according to SCHÜLLER, to confirm the authenticity of a correspondence with the high priest Onias I; but there is no proof of the existence, so often assumed by scholars, of a Jewish community at Sparta, since Josephus could not, as SCHÜLLER rightly remarks, have written that the Spartans make a practice of expelling foreigners (Against Apion 2. 259–260) if there were Jews living there. The mention of only one king at Sparta does not prove spuriousness, since Xenophon also often mentions only one.

HADAS (1987), pp. 84–87, says that Jonathan’s letter (Ant. 13. 166–170) to the Spartans is genuine, but that Areus’ (Ant. 12. 226–227) is spurious. SCHUNCK (1988), pp. 32–33, regards the letters as genuine.



PENNA (1989), pp. 152–155, discusses the terminology of the Maccabees' treaties with the Romans and the Spartans.

CARDAUNS (1990) asserts categorically that of the three letters in Josephus' source, I Maccabees, the first is certainly a forgery, the other two probably also. He argues that politically (we may add, militarily) there was nothing to gain from an alliance with Sparta at this time. We may comment that there was certainly much prestige to be gained and even some military advantage in forming an alliance with Sparta, which, though it had lost much of its glitter by this time, still was rich with memories of military prowess. The letter of Areus is false. Why the attempt to connect the Jews and Sparta? CARDAUNS' answer is to make the equation of Lycurgus and Moses. But if so, we may ask, why did Josephus wait so long before asserting the claim of connection?

WIRGIN (1991) interprets the letter of Areus as merely a proposal to establish business enterprises. When, however, Judah Maccabee saw no point in re-establishing the old business pact with the Spartans, since the Spartans were about to lose their independence, he turned to the new star, Rome.

LEANNEY (1991a) says that Josephus mistakenly assigns the time of the letter from King Areus I of Sparta to Onias the high priest (Ant. 12. 225–228) as the period of Onias III, since he was so much better informed about this era. Though, he says, the letter has been embellished by Josephus, it is more probably genuine than critics have admitted, since we ought not to reject unexpected evidence pertaining to a period of history about which so little evidence is available. The burden of proof is on those who argue that the letter is spurious, since otherwise it would be hard to explain why Sparta was included in a summons from Rome to all peoples to give support to Simon against Antiochus VI and why the high priest Jason, after being deposed, fled to Sparta (II Macc. 5. 9).

## 12.6: Josephus' Version of I Maccabees

- (1992) EMIL SCHÜRER, rev.: JUSTUS VON DESTINON, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII–XVII = Jüd. Krieg. Buch I.* In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 7, 1882, pp. 388–394.
- (1993) HANS DRÜNER: *Untersuchungen über Josephus.* Diss., Marburg 1896. Pp. 35–50: Josephus und das I. Makkabäerbuch.
- (1994) JUSTUS VON DESTINON: *Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus.* Kiel (Programm) 1904 (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Königlichen Gymnasiums zu Kiel).
- (1995) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus für die Zeit vom Exil bis zum jüdischen Krieg.* Diss., Marburg. Printed: Leipzig 1904.
- (1996) FÉLIX PERLES: *Notes sur les Apocryphes et Pseudépigraphes.* In: *Revue des Études juives* 73, 1921, p. 179.
- (1997) MOSHE SCHWABE and EZRA MELAMED: *Zum Text der Seronepisode in I Macc. und bei Josephus.* In: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 72, 1928, pp. 202–204.
- (1998) SOLOMON ZEITLIN, ed., and SIDNEY TEDESCHE, trans.: *The First Book of Maccabees.* New York 1950.

- (999) EZRA Z. MELAMED: Josephus and Maccabees I: A Comparison (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 1, 1951, pp. 122–130.
- (1000) ADOLPHE BÜCHLER: Les sources de Flavius Josèphe dans ses *Antiquités* XII, 5–XIII, 1. In: *Revue des Études juives* 32, 1896, pp. 179–199; 34, 1897, pp. 69–93.
- (1001) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: Les Livres des Maccabées. Paris 1949; 2nd ed., 1949. 3rd ed. by FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL and JEAN STARCKY. Paris 1961.
- (1002) JOHN C. DANCY: A Commentary on I Maccabees. Oxford 1954.
- (1003) ABRAM B. RANOWITSCH: *Ellinizmi ego istoricheskaiia rol'*. Moscow 1950. Trans. into German by KURT DIESING and OTTO ROTH: *Der Hellenismus und seine geschichtliche Rolle*. Berlin 1958.
- (1004) EDWARD R. LEVENSON: New Tendentious Motifs in *Antiquities*: A Study of Development in Josephus' Historical Thought. Diss., M. A., Columbia University, New York 1966.
- (1005) JOHN R. BARTLETT: The First and Second Books of the Maccabees (Cambridge Bible Commentary on the New English Bible). Cambridge 1973.
- (1006) HARRY W. ETTELSON: The Integrity of I Maccabees. In: *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 27, 1925, pp. 249–384.
- (1007) WOLF WIRGIN: On Charismatic Leadership from Simon Maccabaeus until Simon Bar Kochba (Leeds University Oriental Society Monograph Series, 5), Leeds 1964.
- (1008) KLAUS D. SCHUNCK: Die Quellen des I und II Makkabäerbuches. Diss., Greifswald 1953. Publ.: Halle 1954.
- (1009) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (The Anchor Bible, 41). Garden City, New York 1976.
- (1009a) HENRY A. FISCHER: The First Book of Maccabees with Commentary. New York 1948.
- (1009b) MARCO ADINOLFI: Il testamento di Mattatia e i suoi esempi etici (1 Mac 2. 49–68). In: *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annus* 15, 1964–65, pp. 74–97.
- (1009c) WOLF WIRGIN: Simon Maccabaeus and the *Prophetes Pistos*. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 103, 1971, pp. 35–41.
- (1009d) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: The Battle of Bet-Zekharyah. In: *Zion* 39, 1974, pp. 157–182.
- (1009e) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns. New York 1976.
- (1009f) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Sëron and Cestius Gallus at Beith Hëoron. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 108, 1976, pp. 13–21.
- (1009g) DIETER TIMPE: Der römische Vertrag mit den Juden von 161 v. Chr. In: *Chiron* 4, 1974, pp. 133–152.
- (1009h) YORAM TSAFRIR: The Location of the Seleucid Akra in Jerusalem. In: *Revue Biblique* 82, 1975, pp. 501–521.
- (1009i) WOLF WIRGIN: Herod Agrippa 1: King of the Jews (Leeds Univ. Oriental Society, Monograph Series, 10A). Leeds 1968.
- (1009j) FRED O. FRANCIS: The Parallel Letters in Josephus' *Antiquities* and I Maccabees. In: PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER, ed., *Abstracts, Society of Biblical Literature*. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 25–26.
- (1009k) JOHN L. WHITE: Royal Correspondence in Pseudo-Aristeas and the Parallel Letters in Josephus and Eusebius. In: PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER, ed., *Abstracts, Society of Biblical Literature*. Missoula, Montana 1979. P. 26.

SCHÜRER (1992), p. 390, followed by DRÜNER (1993), pp. 35–50, concludes that Josephus' treatment of I Maccabees, his main source for *Antiquities* 12. 242–13. 212, differs hardly at all from his treatment of the material of the Biblical books. Here too, says DRÜNER, Josephus used both a Greek and a Hebrew text, though he preferred the former.

VON DESTINON (1994), pp. 60ff., concludes that Josephus knew both I Maccabees (which he did not have in the form known to us) and certain other documents at second hand. A similar point of view is found in HÖLSCHER (1995), p. 52, who assumes that Josephus was incapable of perceiving the contradictions which his version corrects and that we must therefore assume that he used a secondary source other than I Maccabees.

That the matter is not so simple and that Josephus in fact may have known a Hebrew original of I Maccabees is remarked by PERLES (1996), who notes one instance (*Ant.* 13. 4; cf. I Maccabees 9. 26). Another instance of Josephus' dependence upon a Hebrew original (*Ant.* 12. 288–289; cf. I Maccabees 3. 13–16) is cited by SCHWABE and MELAMED (1997) and accepted by ZEITLIN (1998), who also cites a Hebrew source for *Antiquities* 12. 393 (cf. I Maccabees 7. 8). Further instances are noted by MELAMED (1999), who systematically, if briefly, compares nineteen passages in Josephus and in I Maccabees, and who concludes that Josephus used both the Hebrew original and a Greek translation and that the Greek text was more correct and fuller than ours. ZEITLIN (1998) similarly asserts that Josephus used both a Greek and Hebrew text; but we may suggest that perhaps Josephus had a different recension of either the Greek or Hebrew text, just as he may have had for the books of the Bible.

BÜCHLER (1000) had argued that for the opening chapters of the 'War' Josephus had utilized neither I nor II Maccabees, but that he had employed an unknown source. ABEL and STARCKY (1001) disagree and instead posit Josephus' source as Nicolaus of Damascus, though, since Nicolaus is lost except for fragments, he is hardly much better than BÜCHLER's unknown source.

Though Josephus modifies the text to suit his fancy, ABEL and STARCKY (1001) assert that Josephus' text, for the historical books of the Bible, can be recognized as Lucianic. This is the conclusion also of DANCY (1002), p. 5, who notes that he can be used with advantage to distinguish a proto-Lucianic phrase or to support the Latin as against the Greek.

How close is Josephus to our extant Greek text of I Maccabees, and how are Josephus' changes to be explained? ZEITLIN (1998) concludes that Josephus followed I Maccabees closely but amplified its speeches and sometimes preferred other historians, particularly Polybius (who is indeed mentioned once in the account, *Antiquities* 12. 358–359) and Diodorus (Posidonius, and especially Nicolaus of Damascus, whom Josephus used elsewhere, are more likely sources, we may add). DANCY (1002), pp. 29–31, theorizes, though without evidence, that Josephus had extracts from Polybius and Posidonius available in a handy compilation probably made by Alexandrian Jewish writers. In addition, according to DANCY, Josephus seems to have had before him Nicolaus of Damascus, the 'Letter of Aristaeas', Timagenes, a narrative of the founding of Onias' temple, a list of high priests, and his own 'War'. DANCY concludes that a single sentence might be due to Josephus himself, but that anything more than this is most likely due to another source. The list of sources, we may state, seems too long for such a brief extract; it would have been cumbersome, to say the least, to use so many sources. Josephus' paraphrase is not slavish: he expanded or contracted, being guided chiefly by good sense. "One could wish", says DANCY in despera-

tion, "he had either been more intelligent or more stupid; if the former, his guesses might have been of value in interpreting the text of I Maccabees; if the latter, his version might have helped to establish it".

RANOWITSCH (1003), p. 114, who generally seeks to explain ancient history according to the theories of MARX and ENGELS, goes even further in denying any independent value to Josephus. But, we may suggest, while it is true that the author of I Maccabees was close to the events and perhaps even participated in some of them, Josephus was a descendant of the Hasmoneans and undoubtedly had oral traditions about the earlier family tradition, and yet as a non-participant was more objective than the author of I Maccabees. In addition, as a priest, he often appears to add from his personal knowledge, as well as from family tradition, on matters concerning the priesthood (since the Maccabees were priests) and the Temple.

Josephus' version of these events, we may comment, is not without value. Sometimes (e.g., Ant. 13. 21, cf. I Macc. 9. 40; Ant. 13. 161, cf. I Macc. 11.69) he gives us numbers not found in I Maccabees, or he disagrees (e.g., Ant. 13. 163, cf. I Macc. 11. 74) with its numbers. He gives us other precise information not found in I Maccabees, such as the name of the officer, Apelles, slain by Mattathias (Ant. 12. 270, cf. I Macc. 2. 25). If not for Josephus (Ant. 12. 257–264), we would not know of the Samaritan appeal to Antiochus Epiphanes, nor would we know that Judah Maccabee was defeated by Nicanor at Kapharsalama (Ant. 12. 405), rather than the reverse, as implied in I Maccabees 7. 31–32 (unless we utterly change the import of Josephus by adopting DINDORF's emendations). Finally, Josephus often adds motives (e.g. Ant. 13. 202, cf. I Maccabees 13. 11).

LEVENSON (1004), who compares the 'Antiquities' with I Maccabees at some length, argues that Josephus' changes were designed to prove that the Jews looked to liberty, country, laws, and piety as ideals, just as the Romans did.

BARTLETT (1005) cites Josephus often in his commentary but makes no attempt to advance solutions of his own to the major issues.

Josephus has two accounts of the events of I Maccabees, the first, a highly compressed version in War 1. 31–69, the second a longer one in the 'Antiquities'. ABEL (1001) explains the differences between the accounts in terms of different audiences, the 'Antiquities' being addressed to readers who have a sympathetic curiosity and to whom the religious point of view is inseparable from the material of the work.

DANCY (1002) notes that the figures given for the size of the armies in War 1. 41 show that Josephus was not using I Maccabees; the moralizing comment (War 1. 43–44), he suggests, is the work of a Hellenistic historian, presumably Nicolaus. But Josephus himself, we may note, frequently gives numbers where they are not to be found in his sources, and he is similarly addicted to moralizing.

One of the questions asked by many scholars is why, if Josephus used I Maccabees, he failed to utilize the last three chapters. DANCY (1002) presents one of the most appealing solutions, namely that these last chapters were missing from Josephus' copy of I Maccabees. ZEITLIN (998), pp. 29–31, regards

these chapters as a later accretion and suggests the possibility that they were added after the destruction of the Temple in order to stress the claims of the Hasmonean succession to the high priesthood.

ETTELSON (1006), followed by ABEL and STARCKY (1001), argues that Josephus' copy did possess these chapters, since they are an integral part of the whole.

WIRGIN (1007) similarly suggests that Josephus' copy included these chapters, but that Josephus omitted them because he did not wish to risk offending his friend Agrippa II, inasmuch as it is precisely in these chapters that the Hasmoneans obtain 'forever' leadership of the Jewish nation. But in view of the more serious changes that Josephus makes in his sources it would not have been difficult, we may reply, for him to omit the word 'forever' if he had chosen to paraphrase these chapters.

SCHUNCK (1008), indeed, argues that the contents of these chapters are reflected in Josephus, though admittedly not as a major source, in his account of the career of Simon; but the references, we may comment, are too vague to indicate dependence. A more likely explanation is that noted and rejected by DANCY (1002), namely that Josephus knew that he would have to revert to Nicolaus of Damascus (who, we may add, was already a source even while he was employing I Maccabees) from the reign of John Hyrcanus, and that he anticipated necessity by a few chapters; in addition, we may suggest, Josephus may have regarded Nicolaus as a better informed historical source for the period of these last chapters than I Maccabees.

GOLDSTEIN (1009), in a highly original and provocative commentary, remarks, pp. 55–61, that whereas I Maccabees contradicts Greek and Roman writers and regards the Hasmoneans as nearly infallible, Josephus knew how fallible they proved to be. He was led to modify not only the style but also the content of I Maccabees by the following considerations: 1) he was a proud descendant of Jonathan the Hasmonean and defender of the honor of the Hasmoneans; 2) as a Pharisee he believed in immortality and resurrection; 3) he believed in the veracity of Daniel 7–12; 4) he was proud of the martyrs and believed in the value of martyrdom; 5) he was a proud Jew writing to win admiration for his people from Greek and Roman readers. GOLDSTEIN, pp. 558–568, declares that Josephus found I Maccabees 1. 20–64 (especially 1. 18–32) full of difficulties and was ready to use the drastic methods of modern Bible critics to resolve them. After a systematic comparison of Josephus and I Maccabees 7–16, particularly the remarks about the high priests, GOLDSTEIN, pp. 569–574, concludes that Josephus, realizing that the high priestly list in I Maccabees was basically sound but presented some difficulties, tried to conceal them by giving no dates during this period. He concludes that Josephus, like other great historians of antiquity who wrote works of broad scope, made many mistakes, since he did not have the time to solve all problems and left many unresolved.

FISCHEL (1009a) has an English translation, a very brief introduction, and notes often referring to Josephus.

ADINOLFI (1009b) declares that Josephus (Ant. 12. 279–285) presents a version which has regard for the taste of his Greek-educated audience. He

opposes ZEITLIN (1998), pp. 32, 55, and 87, who had spoken of interpolations in the text of I Maccabees, notably in the will of Mattathias, because of omissions by Josephus.

WIRGIN (1009c) comments on the fact that Josephus omits the events described in I Maccabees 14. 41. He explains this by his hypothesis that Josephus, an astute politician, had probably reason to conceal the story connected with Simon in order to avoid damaging the interests of King Agrippa II and the Herodians at the time when the restoration of the Temple was the topic of the day.

BAR-KOCHVA (1009d) remarks that the most reliable sources of information about the battle of Bet-Zekharyah are I Maccabees, deriving from an eye-witness account, and Josephus' 'War', which uses a Hellenistic source, probably Nicolaus of Damascus, whose information was quite accurate. In *Antiquities* 12. 366–375 Josephus merely paraphrases I Maccabees. The few additions can be attributed to Josephus' acquaintance with the battle area and with Hellenistic warfare or rather to his own recollections used for the 'War' twenty years earlier. As to the relative strength of the force, Josephus' report (War 1. 41) that there were 50,000 infantry and 5000 cavalry in the Syrian force of Antiochus V is not necessarily out of line.

BAR-KOCHVA (1009e), pp. 174–183, similarly concludes that Josephus' account (War 1. 41–46) of the march to Bet-Zekharyah provides some valuable details. The passage, he says, is part of an epitomizer's account of the persecutions, which is sometimes utterly distorted and may be based on the author's memory or perhaps on Nicolaus of Damascus. Josephus' estimate of the numerical strength of the Seleucid armies is not far from the truth.

BAR-KOCHVA (1009f) rejects the views of ZEITLIN (1998) and of MELAMED (1999) that Josephus made use of parallel Greek and Hebrew versions of I Maccabees. All the differences between Josephus and the Greek text of I Maccabees, he says, can be explained by Josephus' tendency to simplify and adapt his material for the Graeco-Roman reader or to offer an independent explanation. Josephus could not, he concludes, have been acquainted with the Hebrew original of I Maccabees.

TIMPE (1009g) concludes that Josephus definitely had I Maccabees before him and that he corrected some of its errors, but that he mistakenly identified the agreement of the Jewish embassy and the Romans with that of the decree of the Senate.

TSAFRIR (1009h) concludes that there is no doubt that Josephus drew most of his information on the Akra from I Maccabees, but that I Maccabees' inclination to abbreviate and his use of allegorical Biblical expressions cause us to fall back on Josephus' work. The conclusion that the Akra could have been situated only in the Lower City is confirmed by Josephus. TSAFRIR admits, however, that one must not accept Josephus' writings without question and that local traditions are reflected in his work.

WIRGIN (1009i) theorizes that Josephus did not include the contents of the last three chapters of I Maccabees because Simon the Hasmonean is so glorified

there that his power would have completely eclipsed the Herodians, especially Agrippa I and II.

FRANCIS (1009j) studies the manner in which, or even whether, the parallel letters which are quoted in Josephus' *'Antiquities'* and in I Maccabees differ from their original form. Like WHITE (1009k), he considers the questions of authenticity, date, introductory and closing formulas, and, in particular, investigates the question whether these formulas have been abbreviated in consequence of being quoted within a narrative source.

### 12.7: Josephus' Relationship to II Maccabees

- (1010) JOHN C. DANCY: *A Commentary on I Maccabees*. Oxford 1954.
- (1011) SOLOMON ZEITLIN, ed., and SIDNEY TEDESCHE, trans.: *The Second Book of Maccabees*. New York 1954. Pp. 76–82: Josephus and Josippon.
- (1012) ISIDORE LÉVY: *Les deux Livres des Maccabées et le livre hébraïque des Hasmonéens*. In: *Semitica* 5, 1955, pp. 15–36.
- (1013) ADOLF WILHELM: *Zu einigen Stellen der Bücher der Makkabäer*. In: *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Anzeiger* 74, 1937, pp. 15–30.
- (1014) ELIAS BICKERMAN (BICKERMAN): *Héliodore au Temple de Jérusalem*. In: *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire orientales et slaves (Brussels, Université libre)* 7, 1939–44, pp. 5–40.
- (1015) STANISLAS LASSALLE: *L'histoire des Temps Maccabéens Reconstituée à l'Aide de citations d'Isaie*. In: *Amif* 1972, pp. 1–39.
- (1016) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: *Commentary on II Maccabees*. To be published in the *Anchor Apocrypha* series.
- (1016a) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (The Anchor Bible, 41)*. Garden City, New York 1976.
- (1016b) ROBERT HANHART: *Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbuches. Probleme der Überlieferung der Auslegung und der Ausgabe*. Göttingen 1961.

In three places, as DANCY (1010) notes, Josephus agrees with II Maccabees; but this is hardly sufficient to indicate Josephus' dependence upon it. Most scholars conclude, as does ZEITLIN (1011), that Josephus did not use II Maccabees for the *'Antiquities'* or most likely did not know of its existence, though his narrative parallels II Maccabees in a number of places.

LÉVY (1012) thinks that there may be a connection between the description of Herod's disease as described in War 1. 656 and *Antiquities* 17. 169 and the disease of Antiochus Epiphanes described in II Maccabees 9. 5. He concludes that the biography of Herod, Josephus' source, furnished Jason, the author of II Maccabees, with the elements of his pastiche, and he proceeds to date Jason in the first century C.E. But, we may reply, perhaps both actually had the same disease, or the description may be a commonplace.

WILHELM (1013) cites *Antiquities* 12. 138–139 to support an emendation of II Maccabees 11. 27–28.

BICKERMAN (1014), comparing II Maccabees 3. 3 and *Antiquities* 12. 138ff., without indicating dependence of one upon the other, comments that II Maccabees employed the same rationalist method as Josephus, who used it in

his explanations, for example, of the appearance of angels as spectres (Ant. 1. 331, 5. 213, 5. 277).

LASSALLE (1015) sees proof that Josephus did not have knowledge of II Maccabees in the fact that Josephus has confused the high priest Onias III, for whom our unique source is II Maccabees, with his brother Jason.

GOLDSTEIN (1016) cites evidence that Josephus knew either II Maccabees or the work of Jason of Cyrene, but that he considered them to be unreliable for the most part, since they were anti-Hasmonean propaganda.

GOLDSTEIN (1016a) believes that the modifications which Josephus made in the account of I Maccabees show conclusively that he had at his disposal the content of II Maccabees and presumably the complete work of Jason of Cyrene. Jason, he thinks, took an interest in the fate of the Samaritan temple (II Macc. 6. 2) and probably included at least some of the material of Antiquities 12. 257–264. Yet, wherever he could, Josephus contradicted Jason's attempts to refute I Maccabees, especially in point of chronology. Josephus, he thinks, probably drew upon a propagandistic history written by the high priest Onias IV.

HANHART (1016b), p. 37, comments on the relationship of Antiquities 12. 261–263 with the source of II Maccabees.

## 12.8: Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) and the Background of the Maccabean Revolt

- (1017) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: Wars I, 1, 1 as an Historical Source (in Hebrew). In: *Mada'ei Hayahadut* 1, 1926, pp. 179–186 (reprinted in his: *The Jews in the Graeco-Roman World*, ed. M. AMIT. Tel-Aviv 1961. Pp. 135–145).
- (1018) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: The Sources of the Period of the Hellenized Rule in Jerusalem. Appendix 1 in his: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959. Pp. 392–397.
- (1019) ELIAS BICKERMANN: *Der G-tt der Makkabäer: Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung*. Berlin 1937. Trans. into English by HORST R. MOEHRING: *The G-d of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 32). Leiden 1979.
- (1020) ELIAS BICKERMANN: *The Maccabees: An Account of Their History from the Beginnings to the Fall of the House of the Hasmoneans*. New York 1947. Rpt. in his: *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Post-Biblical Judaism*. New York 1962.
- (1021) ELIAS BICKERMANN: *The Maccabean Uprising: An Interpretation*. In: JUDAH GOLDIN, ed., *The Jewish Expression*. New York 1970 (trans. by KRISHNA WINSTON) 66–86.
- (1022) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *Wer veranlaßte den Glaubenszwang der Makkabäerzeit?* In: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 82, 1938, pp. 145–172.
- (1023) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959.
- (1024) YITZHAK BAER: *The Persecution of Monotheistic Religion by Antiochus Epiphanes* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 33, 1968, pp. 101–124.
- (1025) ELIAS BIKERMAN (BICKERMANN): *Un document relatif à la persécution d'Antiochos IV Épiphane*. In: *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 115, 1937, pp. 188–223. Trans. into German by GÜNTER MAYER, in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, *Zur Josephus-Forschung* (Wege der Forschung, 84). Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 241–277.
- (1026) KURT GALLING: *Judäa, Galiläa und der Osten im Jahre 163/4 v. Chr.* In: *Palästina-jahrbuch* 36, 1940, pp. 43–77.



- (1027) GEORGES NAGEL: Révolte et réforme à Jérusalem (169–166 avant Jésus-Christ). In: Université de Genève. Recueil de la faculté de théologie protestante 8, 1942, pp. 5–22.
- (1028) HERMAN LUDIN JANSEN: Die Politik Antiochos' des IV. Oslo 1943.
- (1029) JOSEF KLAUSNER: La política económica y marítima de Judea en la época de los Asmoneos Judaica. In: Judaica (Buenos Aires) 26, no. 151, 1946, pp. 24–29 (trans. from Hebrew by DORA HENQUIN).
- (1030) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: The Principal Causes of the Hasmonean Revolution (in Hebrew). In: Maḥanaim 34, 1958, pp. 9–15.
- (1031) ERNST BADIEN: Antiochus Epiphanes and the Rebirth of Judaea. In: History Today 9, 1959, pp. 415–423.
- (1032) FELIKS GRYGLEWICZ: Palestine at the Time of the Seleucids (in Polish). In: Zeszyty Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego 2. 3, 1959, pp. 89–101.
- (1033) JAMES W. PARKES: The Foundations of Judaism and Christianity. London 1960.
- (1034) HEINZ KREISSIG: Der Makkabäeraufstand: Zur Frage seiner Sozialökonomischen Zusammenhänge und Wirkungen. In: Studii Clasice 4, 1962, pp. 143–175.
- (1035) STANISLAS LASSALLE: Incertitudes de Josèphe et certitudes d'Isaïe. In: Bulletin du Cercle Ernest Renan 10, 1963, pp. 1–16.
- (1036) WILLIAM H. C. FREND: Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church: A Study of a Conflict from the Maccabees to Donatus. Oxford 1965.
- (1037) BEN-ZION LURIE: Tribe of Balgea (in Hebrew). In: Beth Mikra 10, 1965, pp. 3–15.
- (1038) MORTON SMITH: Palestinian Judaism from Alexander to Pompey. In: PIERRE GRIMAL, ed., Hellenism and the Rise of Rome. New York 1968. Pp. 250–261. Trans. by A. M. SHERIDAN SMITH from: Der Hellenismus und der Aufstieg Roms. Frankfurt am Main 1965. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed., Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature. New York 1977. Pp. 183–197.
- (1039) MENAHEM STERN: The Documents on the History of the Hasmonaean Revolt (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1965.
- (1040) MENAHEM STERN: The Hasmonean Revolt and Its Place in the History of Jewish Society and Religion. In: Journal of World History 11, 1968, pp. 92–106. Rpt. in: HAIM H. BEN-SASSON and SAMUEL ETTINGER, ed., Jewish Society through the Ages. London 1971. Pp. 92–106.
- (1041) BONAVENTURA MARIANI: L'alleanza e l'amicizia dei Maccabei con i Romani sotto l'aspetto teocratico. In: Divinitas 9, 1965, pp. 75–104.
- (1042) OTTO MØRKHOLM: Antiochus IV of Syria. Diss., Aarhus Universitet (Classica et mediaevalia, Dissertationes, vol. 8). Copenhagen 1966.
- (1043) THÉRÈSE LIEBMANN-FRANKFORT: Rome et le conflit judéo-syrien (164–161 avant notre ère). In: L'Antiquité Classique 38, 1969, pp. 101–120.
- (1044) LUDOVICUS MENDELSSOHN: Senati [sic] consulta Romanorum quae sunt in Iosephi Antiquitatibus. In: Acta Societatis Philologicae Lipsiensis 5, 1875, pp. 87–288.
- (1045) EUGEN TÄUBLER: Imperium Romanum. Studien zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des römischen Reiches. 1: Die Staatsverträge und Vertragsverhältnisse. Leipzig 1913.
- (1046) SIMON M. DUBNOW: The War of the Hasmoneans (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1947.
- (1047) MARTIN HENGEL: Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. Tübingen 1969, 2nd ed. 1973. Trans. into English by JOHN BOWDEN: Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period. 2 vols. Philadelphia 1974.
- (1048) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: Was Jerusalem a 'Polis'? (in Hebrew). In: Erez-Israel 1, 1951, pp. 94–101. Rpt. in his: The Jews in the Greco-Roman World (Tel-Aviv 1960) 199–216. Trans. into English in: Israel Exploration Journal 14, 1964, pp. 61–78.
- (1049) PIETER VAN'T HOF: Bijdrage tot de kennis van Antiochus IV Epiphanes Koning van Syrië. Diss., Amsterdam 1955.

- (1050) JOHANNES SCHAUMBERGER: Die neue Seleukiden-Liste BM 35603 und die makka-bäische Chronologie. In: *Biblica* 36, 1955, pp. 423–435.
- (1051) MARTIN A. COHEN: The Hasmonean Revolution Politically Considered: Outline of a New Interpretation. In: SAUL LIEBERMAN and ARTHUR HYMAN, edd., *Salo Wittmayer Baron Jubilee Volume*. Jerusalem 1974 (i.e. 1975). Vol. 1. Pp. 263–285.
- (1051a) MARTIN A. COHEN: The Hasmonean Revolution Politically Considered. In: *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal* 22. 4, 1975, pp. 13–34.
- (1051b) SAMUEL T. LACHS: The Date of Lamentations V. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 57, 1966–67, pp. 46–56.
- (1051c) MOSHE PEARLMAN: *The Maccabees*. New York 1973.
- (1051d) FERGUS MILLAR: The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's 'Judaism and Hellenism'. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29, 1978, pp. 1–21.
- (1051e) MAURICE HOLLEAUX: *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques*, vol. 3. Paris 1942.
- (1051f) A. BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ: *Histoire des Séleucides* (323–64 avant J. C.), 2 vols. Paris 1913–1914.
- (1051g) JOSHUA EPHRON: The Hasmonean Revolt in Modern Historiography (in Hebrew). In: *Historians and Historical Schools. Lectures Delivered at the Seventh Convention of the Historical Society of Israel*, December 1961. Jerusalem 1962, 1977. Pp. 117–143. Rpt. in: BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA, ed., *The Seleucid Period in Eretz Israel: Studies on the Persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmonean Revolt*. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 131–153. Rpt. (in lengthened form) in JOSHUA EPHRON: *Studies of the Hasmonean Period: Seven Topics*. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 15–40.
- (1051h) HUGO WILLRICH: *Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur*. Göttingen 1924.
- (1051i) EDUARD MEYER: *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, vol. 2. Stuttgart 1925.
- (1051j) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The History of the Second Jewish Commonwealth; Prolegomena*. Philadelphia 1933.
- (1051k) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *History of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew), vol. 3. Jerusalem 1949.
- (1051l) AVIGDOR TCHERIKOVER: *The Jews and the Greeks in the Hellenistic Period* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1930.
- (1051m) ANDRÉ LACOQUE: *Le Livre de Daniel* (Commentaire de l'Ancient Testament, 15a). Paris 1976. Trans. into English by DAVID PELLAUER and revised by the author: *The Book of Daniel*. Atlanta and London 1979.
- (1051n) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: The Persecution of the Jews by Antiochus IV. In: *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 1973. Vol. 1, Jerusalem 1977, pp. 135–147.

TCHERIKOVER (1017), who focusses particularly on Josephus' account of Antiochus Epiphanes, says that Josephus as a source prior to the revolt of Judah the Maccabee is worthless. He judiciously declares (1018) that Josephus' sources for his accounts of Antiochus Epiphanes (War 1. 31–33, Ant. 12. 237ff.) are obscure, though his main source, we must add, is clearly I Maccabees.

BICKERMANN (1019), a popular version of which (1020) is now available in English, though based mainly on the Books of Maccabees, draws on Josephus in his challenging thesis that it was not Antiochus Epiphanes but the Jewish Hellenizers, who, in their goal of winning acceptance from the peoples about them, sought decrees persecuting the Torah-true Jews, and that Antiochus intervened for purely political, not religious, reasons. He successfully contends that the Maccabees ironically, after triumphing over the Hellenizers, themselves

assimilated Greek ideas, thus saving the Jewish religion from the kind of mummification that overtook the Egyptian religion. In a recent popular essay (1021) he again maintains the thesis that the Maccabean movement should be understood against the background of a civil war between the Hellenizers and the traditionalists. [See *infra*, p. 917.]

HEINEMANN (1022) argues against BICKERMANN that while the Jewish Hellenists carry some guilt, since Antiochus did not have to fear their resistance, Josephus (*Ant.* 12. 138ff., 145–146, and especially 251ff.) shows that they did not share Antiochus' goal of the complete elimination of Judaism. Forced apostasy, he contends against BICKERMANN, emanated not from the Hellenizers but from Antiochus. Again, as TCHERIKOVER (1023), p. 184, has rightly contended, the sources themselves speak only of Antiochus' role as a religious persecutor and say nothing in this connection about the Hellenizers.

BAER (1024) argues vehemently against BICKERMANN, contending that the formulae in Antiochus' edict reappear later in the decrees of persecution of Roman Emperors and that the Hellenizing priests served only as playthings in his hands. But, we may reply, the use of the same formulae does not mean that they had the same motives.

We may here comment that the Maccabean revolt was to a great extent a manifestation of the struggle between the small peasants and the urban plebs against a small group of wealthy Jews of high birth. The attempt to look upon the revolt as largely a feud between such families as the Tobiads and the Oniads is to disregard the fact that the Hellenistic period is one in which families break their monolithic alignment on political questions and strong individuals emerge. Another key factor in the revolt was one of international politics in that the Oniads refused to pay tribute to Ptolemy Euergetes in their belief that the days of Ptolemaic rule were numbered; and this may well have been reinforced by Seleucus II Callinicus' successful offensive against Ptolemy.

BICKERMANN (1025) affirms the authenticity of the document quoted in *Antiquities* 12. 257; and, in the last analysis, we may add, it is BICKERMANN's proofs that documents such as this are authentic that constitute his most lasting contribution to the subject.

GALLING (1026), in a survey investigating the goal of the Maccabean movement, is especially dependent upon I Maccabees and, to a much lesser degree, on Josephus.

NAGEL (1027) has a general survey in which he looks at the conflict between the Orthodox and Hellenized Jews; but, as we must here caution, the so-called 'Orthodox' Jews were Hellenized to a considerable degree.

JANSEN (1028) gives a critical appraisal of our sources concerning Antiochus Epiphanes.

KLAUSNER (1029) (1030) has a cursory, patriotic survey, in which he contends that the principal cause for the Maccabean revolt was the political, economic, and spiritual development of the Jewish people in their homeland during the preceding four hundred years; but, we may ask, why did it take so long for matters to come to a head? The answer would seem to be the role of

Antiochus and the Jewish Hellenizers, who indeed played more than a catalyst's role in the reaction.

BADIAN (1031), in a popular article, charges that there is no evidence that the Hellenizing Jews disregarded the major laws of Judaism; in fact, he says, their widespread following among the priests, as well as the failure of the uniformly hostile tradition to charge them with such disregard suggest the opposite. But, we may reply, Josephus himself (*Ant.* 12. 240–241) answers that the Tobiad faction of the high priests, supported by a minority of the people, informed Antiochus that they wished to abandon the laws of Judaism and to adopt the Greek way of life; and when he had granted this, they even went so far as to conceal their circumcision and to give up other practices of Judaism.

GRYGLEWICZ (1032), to judge from the English summary of this article, connects the revolt with the disintegration of the Seleucid empire following dynastic struggles. Antiochus' purpose in Hellenizing his realm was to unite the widely differing provinces into a single state. But, we may reply, the theory connecting the rise of the rejuvenated Jewish state with the power vacuum created by the decline of the Seleucids is an oversimplification, since long before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes the Seleucids were having difficulties controlling their subject peoples, especially in Asia Minor and central Asia and governed, in effect, a federation of independent or quasi-independent states.

PARKES (1033), pp. 84–94, has a popular survey of the Maccabean revolt and of its significance.

KREISSIG (1034) presents a Marxist analysis, stressing social and economic factors in the revolt; he concludes that where fragments of other historians such as Strabo, Timagenes, Castor, and Apollodorus, are traceable in Josephus' work, he has a certain value as a source; but this value is diminished through Josephus' reworking of them.

LASSALLE (1035), in an article based on fantasy, compares Josephus' account of the Maccabean times with that which he reads into a number of passages in the book of Isaiah and expresses preference for the account in the dark verses of Isaiah. He argues that the interpolators of Isaiah confused living history, while Josephus was partial and often combined contradictory sources.

FREND (1036), pp. 51–55, discussing Josephus' testimony on the great part which voluntary suffering and death, especially passive resistance, played during this period, generally accepts him at face value as a fair-minded if interested contemporary observer, an estimate, we may suggest, that is too generous in view of Josephus' admitted descent from the Hasmoneans.

LURIE (1037), commenting on *Antiquities* 12.239ff., identifies the Hellenizing Tobiads with the priestly tribe of Balgea (Bilgah) mentioned in rabbinic literature (*Sukkah* 56b).

SMITH (1038) correctly stresses that the Maccabean revolt was not a revolt against all Hellenism as such. As to the Torah, the Maccabees were devoted to its preservation but liberal in its interpretation, notably in permitting fighting on the Sabbath in self-defense.

STERN (1039) presents twenty-two documents from the Books of Maccabees and Josephus (including Ant. 12. 138–144, 12. 145–146, 12. 258–264, 13. 260–265, 14. 145–148, 14. 233, and 14. 247–255), together with introductions and commentaries, particularly in the light of papyrology, epigraphy, and numismatics. He has a good discussion of Josephus' sources and successfully argues that Josephus' chief source in addition to I Maccabees was Nicolaus of Damascus.

STERN (1040), in a popular essay, stresses that the greatest danger to Judaism during this period was the split between the ruling classes and the masses which would lead to the fusing of the former with the ruling Greeks and would doom the others to a long period of relative stagnation. He stresses that the revolt brought new families, such as that of Josephus, to the fore of Jewish society. He discerns two primary motives for Antiochus' decrees – the stubborn resistance of the Jews to changes in government and society and Antiochus' personal revulsion to Jewish exclusivistic monotheism which was foreign to his liberal world-view.

MARIANI (1041) comments that there is no theological reason why the Maccabees could not make a treaty of friendship with the Romans; the Books of Kings, we may add, provide ample precedent for such alliances with idolatrous nations; and the alliance brought obvious advantages to the Jews.

MØRKHOLM (1042), pp. 135–165, concludes that the 'War' gives a rather confused account of the events from the accession of Antiochus IV onwards. MØRKHOLM regards Antiochus IV as a politician and statesman rather than as a mystic or missionary. He cites as evidence the fact that in 164, when the reality of the situation dawned upon him, Antiochus was enough of a statesman to make an honest effort to correct his mistakes.

LIEBMANN-FRANKFORT (1043), commenting on the treaty between the Maccabees and the Romans, expresses a preference for the version in I Maccabees 8. 23–30 rather than the text in Antiquities 12. 417–419, since she says, following MENDELSSOHN (1044), pp. 96–98, and TÄUBLER (1045), p. 242, that Josephus must have reproduced the treaty in the official Roman style.

DUBNOW (1046) looks upon the conflict between the traditionalists and the Hellenizers as a sharp clash between two mutually exclusive ways of life; but HENGEL (1047) attempts to show, though hardly convincingly, as noted above, the degree to which Hellenization had already made its way into the main stream of Jewish life long before the Maccabees.

TCHERIKOVER (1048) argues that the political and legal use of such terms as δῆμος, πλῆθος, ἐκκλησία, βουλή, συνέδριον, ἄρχοντες, γνώριμοι, δυνατοί, and ἄρχιερεῖς in Josephus is not sufficiently precise and contends, against the assumption of SCHÜRER and SCHALIT, that Jerusalem was not organized as a Hellenistic *polis* at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

VAN'T HOF (1049) has a chapter, pp. 82–96, on Antiochus' relations with the Jews.

SCHAUMBERGER (1050) discusses a text in the British Museum which illuminates the difficult problem of the chronology of the Books of Maccabees, especially with regard to Antiochus Epiphanes.

Like BICKERMANN (1019)(1020)(1021), HENGEL (1047) says that the Jewish Hellenists, who also were motivated by intellectual interests, in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes knew that their rule could be assured only if they could root out the traditional Jewish religion; and so it was they who were responsible for the escalation of events in Judaea. HENGEL suggests that the Jewish Hellenists perhaps denied the theory that the ritual commandments which brought about the segregation of the Jews had come from Moses. But, we may reply, this would imply that they were ready to abide by the law of Moses, whereas in fact they did not observe even the commandment of circumcision. Again, HENGEL cites the Mishnah (Sanhedrin 10.1) that no one will have a share in the world to come who asserts that there is no Torah from heaven as referring perhaps to assimilationist Jews who believed that the Torah had been modified after Moses' time. But here, too, the implication of the view that the Torah had been modified after Moses' time is not to deny that Moses had received the Torah from G-d but rather to assert that it had been emended without authorization after his time. HENGEL is misleading when he declares that the failure of the Hellenistic reformers to abolish the Torah meant that any fundamental theological criticism of the law could no longer develop freely within Judaism. We may comment, however, that the Talmud contains many examples of adaptations of the law, such as the decrees of Rabban Gamaliel.

COHEN (1051), in an article which is largely speculative in its attempt to fit the Hasmonean revolution into the pattern of revolutions generally, declares that there were six factions of Jews, all but one politically anti-Seleucid, led by the Hasmoneans, engaged in an internecine struggle for control of Judaeian society. He argues that the Hellenists consisted of more than aristocrats and that the majority of the people supported them. He declares that the Hellenists did not flout even one of the laws of the Torah prior to 168–167 B.C.E. He argues that the case for pre-Antiochian Hellenistic influence on the Jews is strong, though he admits that it is inferential. In reply we may reiterate what we have said concerning HENGEL's (1047) book, namely that there is little doubt that a superficial knowledge of Greek was widespread, but that there is little evidence that it was at all deep. Josephus, says COHEN, borrowed heavily from I Maccabees, but even where he does not he reflects its partisan attitude. He says that the appointment of Jason and the enticement of Hellenistic privileges can well be understood as measures intended to reduce subversion and to return Judaea to Seleucid control. COHEN adopts the dangerous argument from modern analogy, contending that the claims of the Hasmoneans that their opponents were aping the ways of the Hellenists completely parallels the charges of political groups in history that their adversaries have assimilated the ways of the enemy.

COHEN (1051a) is a reprint, with a minimum of revision, of his article in the *Baron Festschrift* (1051), with notes restricted to representative items.

LACHS (1051b) suggests that the language, events described, and the mood of I and II Maccabees and *Antiquities* 12 offer striking parallels to chapter 5 of Lamentations in the Bible, which, LACHS says, refers to the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanus in 168 B.C.E. We may reply, however, that the parallels are generally commonplace.

PEARLMAN (1051c) has a popular, lavishly illustrated account, written with a sense of drama, with frequent reference to archaeological finds, as well as to Josephus.

MILLAR (1051d) follows Diodorus in declaring that Antiochus Epiphanes intended to abolish by force all observance of the Torah. The reform attempt initiated from within the community was confined to the high priesthood of Jason; and we should not, says MILLAR, look for the intellectual background of syncretistic reform within Judaism. He concludes that Josephus' account of the Maccabean revolution is secondary, filled with abbreviations and confusions, being separated by two and a half centuries from the events in question.

HOLLEAUX (1051e), pp. 260–279, criticizes BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ (1051f) for suggesting that Josephus had confused Antiochus III and IV and had misread Polybius (Josephus, he notes, has twice cited Polybius literally in this same Book 12). He focusses, in particular, on Josephus' account of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes (Ant. 12. 358–359). We may comment that the fact that Josephus cites Polybius literally in two places does not mean that he may not have misunderstood him elsewhere; in fact, where he does not quote him we may suggest that he indeed misinterpreted him.

EPHRON (1051g) has a brief survey of many works, notably WILLRICH (1051h), MEYER (1051i), BICKERMANN (1019), ZEITLIN (1051j), KLAUSNER (1051k), and TCHERIKOVER (1051l), and shows how much *odium theologicum* there has been in scholars dealing with this period.

LACOCQUE (1051m), p. 232, commenting on Daniel 11. 39, cites the view of TCHERIKOVER (1018), p. 189, that the new Gentile settlers to be established by Antiochus in Jerusalem were to be soldiers, since every cleruchy or *katoikia* in the Hellenistic period was military in its membership and organization.

GOLDSTEIN (1051n) remarks that Antiochus' persecution of the Jews, which is unparalleled in Greek history, bears a strong resemblance, point by point, to the decree suppressing the Bacchanalia in 186 B.C.E. and suggests that since Antiochus was a hostage in Rome at that time he thence derived the idea.

## 12.9: Mattathias and Judah Maccabee

- (1052) JAMES C. G. GREIG: The Teacher of Righteousness and the Qumran Community. In: New Testament Studies 2, 1955–56, pp. 119–126.
- (1053) THEODOOR VAN TICHELEN: Judas de Makkabeër (167–161 voor J.C.). Antwerpen 1947.
- (1054) EITAN AVISHAR: The Campaigns of Judas Maccabaeus (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1955; 2nd ed., Ramat-Gan 1968.
- (1055) OTTO PLÖGER: Die Feldzüge der Seleukiden gegen den Makkabäer Judas. In: Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 74, 1958, pp. 158–188. Reprinted in his: Aus der Spätzeit des Alten Testaments. Göttingen 1971. Pp. 135–164.
- (1056) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: Topographie des campagnes Machabéennes. In: Revue Biblique 32, 1923, pp. 495–521; 33, 1924, pp. 201–217, 371–387; 34, 1925, pp. 194–216; 35, 1926, pp. 206–222, 510–533.
- (1056a) KARL H. RENGSTORF: Die Stadt der Mörder (Mt. 22, 7). In: WALTHER ELTESTER, ed., Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche; Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. (Beihefte zur

Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 26). Berlin 1960; 2nd ed., 1964. Pp. 106–129.

(1057) See Addenda, p. 917.

(1057a) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns. New York 1976.

(1057b) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Sëron and Cestius Gallus at Beith Ȧoron. In: Palestine Exploration Quarterly 108, 1976, pp. 13–21.

GREIG (1052) inconclusively identifies the Teacher of Righteousness of the Dead Sea Community with Mattathias (Ant. 12. 265ff.).

VAN TICHELEN (1053) has a popular account for which Josephus is a major source.

AVISHAR (1054) has a popular survey of Judah Maccabee's military campaigns based solely on I Maccabees; but, we may contend, this is hardly justified, since sometimes Josephus seems to have used independent sources.

PLÖGER (1055) has a systematic survey of the topography of the Maccabean campaign which is largely indebted to ABEL (1056).

RENGSTORF (1056a), commenting on Antiquities 12. 327–329 and its parallel, I Maccabees 5. 1–5, concerning Judah Maccabee's destruction of his enemies, claims that Josephus here employs an old Oriental *topos* which is found in Assyrian and Neo-Babylonian as well as in rabbinic texts to depict the radical end of a city. But, we may reply, RENGSTORF does not consider to what extent Josephus may have been influenced by the occurrence of this *topos* in Greek, especially historical, literature and military handbooks, by which he was certainly much influenced elsewhere. In any case, the idea of destroying the murderers in a city and then burning it is hardly unique in the passages cited by RENGSTORF; it is, in fact, a commonplace in military activities of many nations and many eras.

BAR-KOCHVA (1057a), pp. 184–200, commenting on Bacchides' campaign against Judah Maccabee at Elasa (160 B.C.E.), concludes that Josephus' account of Judah's campaigns paraphrases I Maccabees.

BAR-KOCHVA (1057b) discusses the parallel between, on the one hand, the ambushing at Beith Horon of Seron, the Seleucid commander, by Judah Maccabee at the beginning of the Hasmonean revolt (I Macc. 3. 13–26; Ant. 12. 288–292) and, on the other hand, the blockade of the descent by a Jewish horde against Cestius Gallus, the Roman governor of Syria in 66 (War 2. 499–555). For the former, Josephus is merely a verbal paraphrase of I Maccabees and has no value. Josephus calls Seron *stratēgos*, which he could not have been. Again, an accusation of exceeding his authority could not have been made against a governor, who was commander-in-chief.

## 12.10: Antiochus V, VI, and VII

(1058) GODFREY R. DRIVER: The Judaean Scrolls. The Problem and a Solution. Oxford 1965.

(1059) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles. In: Harvard Theological Review 61, 1968, pp. 451–481.

(1060) HENRI SEYRIG: Notes on Syrian Coins. In: Numismatic Notes and Monographs, no. 119. New York 1950.



- (1061) EUGÈNE CAVAINAC: A propos des monnaies de Tryphon. L'ambassade de Scipion Emilien. In: *Revue Numismatique* 13, 1951, pp. 131–138.
- (1062) YEHUDA H. LANDAU: A Greek Inscription from Acre. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 11, 1961, pp. 118–126.
- (1063) THOMAS FISCHER: Untersuchungen zum Partherkrieg Antiochus' VII im Rahmen der Seleukidengeschichte. Diss., München 1970. Tübingen 1970.
- (1063a) JACOB LICHT: The Qumran Sect and Its Scrolls. In: *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8, edd. MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 125–152, 352–360.
- (1063b) ISAAC RABINOWITZ: The Meaning of the Key ('Demetrius') Passage of the Qumran Nahum-Pesher. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 98, 1978, pp. 394–399.

DRIVER (1058) comments on Josephus' errors in chronology in giving the number of years (Ant. 20. 234) during which the Jews lived under a democratic form of government until the reign of Antiochus V Eupator as 414. Here, as elsewhere, it is not clear what Josephus' starting point is: if it is from the return from Babylon it should be 373 years, if from the beginning of the captivity 443, if from the end of the captivity and in accordance with the chronology implicit in *Antiquities* 13. 301, it should be 421. The systems of chronology, as WACHOLDER (1059) has shown, were many and various; and, in any case, none of the figures available to us permit us to arrive at a figure of 414.

SEYRIG (1060), pp. 14–17, maintains 142–139 as the dates for Tryphon's coinage, but is troubled by *Antiquities* 13. 187 and 13. 218, which connect Tryphon's murder of Antiochus VI with the defeat of Demetrius II in 139. In the end he prefers the numismatic evidence against Josephus' chronology. CAVAINAC (1061) supports the same dates, noting evidence that the Romans supported Demetrius II against Tryphon in 143 following Scipio's embassy to the East.

LANDAU (1062) describes a newly-discovered inscription dedicated to Zeus in honor of King Antiochus VII Sidetes. It employs the epithet Σωτήρ used by Josephus (Ant. 13. 222 and 271) but previously not found elsewhere, as well as another, Καλλίνικος, previously unknown.

FISCHER (1063), pp. 6–23, discusses the value of Josephus as a source as well as Josephus' sources. In particular, he gives a detailed analysis of Josephus' sources for *Antiquities* 12. 240–13. 300. He concludes that Josephus' chief source until *Antiquities* 13. 212 was I Maccabees, but that thereafter he had one major source, a Syrian history, in addition to the 'War'. By comparing Josephus and I Maccabees, he tries, with rather little success, in view of the meager hints in Josephus, to arrive at the nature of this history.

LICHT (1063a) remarks that according to most scholars the king mentioned in Pesher Nahum (4QpNah) is Demetrius III Eucaerus, noting that, according to Josephus (Ant. 13. 375–376 and War 1. 90–98), a party of Jews who rebelled against Alexander Jannaeus invited Demetrius to invade the country.

RABINOWITZ (1063b) identifies the Demetrius mentioned in 4QpNah 3–4 I: 1–2 as Demetrius I Soter (162–150 B.C.E.), rather than, as generally believed, as Demetrius Eucaerus (ca. 95–88 B.C.E.).

**12.11: The Rulers of Egypt during the Third, Second, and First Centuries B.C.E.**

- (1064) JAKOB COHEN: *Judaica et Aegyptiaca. De Maccabaeorum libro III quaestiones historicae*. Groningen 1941.
- (1065) JOHN C. DANCY: *A Commentary on I Maccabees*. Oxford 1954.
- (1066) ISIDORE LÉVY: *Ptolémée Lathyré et les Juifs*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23.2, 1950–51, pp. 127–136.
- (1067) HUGO WILLRICH: *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung*. Göttingen 1895.
- (1068) HUGO WILLRICH: *Der historische Kern des III. Makkabäerbuches*. In: *Hermes* 39, 1904, pp. 244–258.
- (1069) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: *Prolegomena*. In: VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER and ALEXANDER FUKS, edd., *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass. 1957. Pp. 1–111.
- (1070) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (trans. by SHIMON APPLEBAUM). Philadelphia 1959.
- (1070a) T. ROBERT S. BROUGHTON: *Cleopatra and “the Treasure of the Ptolemies”*. In: *American Journal of Philology* 63, 1942, pp. 328–332.
- (1070b) ILSE BECHER: *Das Bild der Kleopatra in der griechischen und lateinischen Literatur* (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft, 51). Berlin 1966. Pp. 63–68.
- (1070c) CLAIRE PRÉAUX: *L’économie royale des Lagides*. Bruxelles 1939.
- (1070d) ERNLE BRADFORD: *Cleopatra*. London 1971.
- (1070e) L. SANTI AMANTINI: *Toleмео VI Filometore re di Siria?* In: *Rendiconti dell’Istituto Lombardo Classe di Lettere e Scienze Morali e Storiche* 108, 1974, pp. 511–529.
- (1070f) ARIE KASHER: *Three Jewish Communities of Lower Egypt in the Ptolemaic Period*. In: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 2, 1975, pp. 113–123.
- (1070g) ARIE KASHER: *First Jewish Military Units in Ptolemaic Egypt*. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 9, 1978, pp. 57–67.
- (1070h) JOSEPH D. AMUSIN: *The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166)*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 48, 1977, pp. 123–152.

COHEN (1064), pp. 30–34, contains the text of *Against Apion* 2. 49–55, concerning the Jews in Egypt under Ptolemy Philometor and Ptolemy Physcon.

DANCY (1065), who is critical of Josephus’ value, prefers *I Maccabees* 11. 10 and *Diodorus* 32. 9c in regarding as trumped up the charge that Alexander Balas had plotted to assassinate Ptolemy Philometor (*Ant.* 13. 106–108).

LÉVY (1066) corrects WILLRICH (1067), p. 150, and (1068), pp. 244–246, who had suggested that Josephus’ account (*Against Apion* 2. 51–55) of Ptolemy Euergetes II (Physcon)’s attempt during his reign (145–116 B.C.E.) to exterminate the Egyptian Jews by sending a herd of drunken elephants against them actually reflects a persecution of 88 B.C.E. LÉVY argues for 102 B.C.E., when Ptolemy IX Lathyrus defeated and massacred the Jews under their commanders Helkias and Hananiah at the Yarkon River. That we have a very similar story, in which the persecution is attributed to Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–203 B.C.E.) shows that the account is probably a *topos*; and yet, as TCHERIKOVER (1069), pp. 21–23, and (1070), pp. 281–283, notes, the fact that the event was commemorated annually by Alexandrian Jews on a fixed day indicates that there was some basis for it. Actually the Jews did support Physcon’s rival

Cleopatra, and after the former's triumph some of the Jews were arrested and just as suddenly set free when Physcon married Cleopatra; this, as TCHERIKOVER plausibly suggests, may be the kernel of the version in Josephus.

BROUGHTON (1070a) successfully upholds Dio Cassius and Josephus (Ant. 15. 90) in their view that Cleopatra intended to seize the treasures of the Egyptian temples, and shows that there is no evidence for the existence of an ancestral treasure of the Ptolemies upon which Cleopatra intended to draw.

I have not seen BECHER's (1070b) discussion of Josephus' portrayal of Cleopatra.

PRÉAUX (1070c) is critical of Josephus as a source for the economic history of the Ptolemies. For example, he notes (p. 306) that Diodorus (19. 85. 4) relates that Ptolemy Soter established in Egypt eight thousand soldiers captured in the battle of Gaza. Josephus (Ant. 12. 4–8) also mentions this, he says, but with less precision. Again, he remarks (p. 417) that Josephus (Ant. 12. 158) is too much inclined to present as tribute and exactions the imposts demanded of Jews.

BRADFORD (1070d), pp. 172–173, argues that Josephus, as a client of the Emperor Vespasian, wrote with traditional anti-Cleopatra bias.

SANTI AMANTINI (1070e) discusses Josephus' account of Ptolemy Philometor's dispute with Antiochus Epiphanes for the suzerainty of Syria.

KASHER (1070f) asserts that Josephus' testimony as to the privileges conferred on the Jews by Ptolemy III is reinforced by inscriptions dedicated to this king. Inscriptions similarly confirm Josephus' testimony on the antiquity of Alexandria as a mother community.

KASHER (1070g) argues for the authenticity of the evidence (Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 186–205) of the immigration of the priest Hezekiah with a Jewish group to Egypt, and calls this a military settlement. But, we may comment, Hecataeus (*ap. Against Apion* 1. 187) says nothing of his military background; the only features that he does single out are that he was an intellectual, an able speaker, and an adroit businessman. KASHER says that Josephus is generally discredited in his statements about Jewish military service in Alexander's days, and that this should be re-examined.

AMUSIN (1070h) argues that Josephus enables us to decode several references in texts found at Qumran. In particular, he says that 4Q 161 (= 4Q Isa<sup>a</sup>) presupposes the march of Ptolemy Lathyrus from Acco to Judaea (Ant. 13.336). This is referred to in a fragment of a commentary to the Book of Isaiah 10. 28–34.

## 12.12: Anti-Semitism in Ptolemaic Egypt

- (1071) RALPH MARCUS: Antisemitism in the Hellenistic-Roman World. In: KOPPEL S. PINSON, ed., *Essays on Antisemitism*. New York 1942. Pp. 1–25. 2nd ed., 1946: pp. 61–78.
- (1072) THEODOR HOPFNER: Die Judenfrage bei Griechen und Römern. (Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Prag, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Heft 8). Prag 1943.

- (1073) JULES ISAAC: *Genèse de l'Antisemitisme. Essai historique*. Paris 1956. Trans. into German by MARGARETE VENJAKOB: *Genesis des Antisemitismus. Vor und nach Christus*. Wien 1969.
- (1074) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Philosemitism among Ancient Intellectuals*. In: *Tradition* 1, 1958–59, pp. 27–39.
- (1075) JEAN YOYOTTE: *L'Égypte ancienne et les origines de l'antijudaïsme*. Résumé in: *Revue de l'Histoire de Religions* 163, 1963, pp. 133–143 (= *Bulletin de société Ernest Renan*).
- (1076) LUIS FARRÉ: *Apión y el antisemitismo* (Colección Hojas al viento, 4). Buenos Aires 1964.
- (1077) MAURILIO ADRIANI: *Note sull'antisemitismo antico*. In: *Studi e materiali di storia delle Religioni* 36, 1965, pp. 63–98.
- (1078) JOHANAN KAHN-JASHAR: *Apion: Prototype of Pre-Christian Anti-Semitism* (in Hebrew). In: *Maḥanaim* 112, 1967, pp. 110–111.
- (1079) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Apion*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 3, Jerusalem 1971, p. 178.
- (1080) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Josephus Flavius*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (1081) LOUIS FINKELSTEIN: *Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 36, 1943, pp. 1–38.
- (1082) ELIAS BICKERMANN: *Ritualmord und Eselkult. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte antiker Publizistik*. In: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 71, 1927, pp. 171–187, 255–264.
- (1083) ELIAS BICKERMANN: *Der G-tt der Makkabäer. Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung*. Berlin 1937.
- (1084) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *Antisemitismus*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. 5, 1931, cols. 3–43.
- (1084a) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *The Attitude of the Ancients toward Judaism* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 4, 1938–39, pp. 269–293. Rpt. in: MENAHEM STERN, ed. *for Historical Society of Israel: Hellenistic Views on Jews and Judaism*. Jerusalem 1974. Pp. 7–31.
- (1084b) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *The Attitude of the Ancient World toward Judaism*. In: *Review of Religion* 4, 1939–40, pp. 385–400.
- (1084c) LUKAS VISCHER: *Le prétendu 'culte de l'âne' dans l'Église primitive*. In: *Revue d'Histoire des Religions* 139, 1951, pp. 14–35.
- (1084d) H(AROLD) IDRIS BELL: *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Liverpool 1953; 2nd ed., 1954.
- (1084e) JACK FINEGAN: *Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus; an introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha and to some of the areas through which they were transmitted, namely, Jewish, Egyptian, and Gnostic Christianity, together with the earlier Gospel-type records in the Apocrypha, in Greek and Latin texts, translations and explanations*. Philadelphia and Boston 1969.
- (1084f) LÉON POLIAKOV: *Histoire de l'antisémitisme*. Vol. 1: *Du Christ aux juifs de cour*. Paris 1955. Trans. into English by RICHARD HOWARD: *The History of Anti-Semitism*. Vol. 1: *From the Time of Christ to the Court Jews*. New York 1965, 1974. Trans. into German: *Geschichte des Antisemitismus*. Vol. 1: *Von der Antike bis zu den Kreuzzügen*. Worms 1977. Rpt. of chap. 1 of German trans. in ANNELIESE MANNZMANN, ed.: *Judenfeindschaft in Altertum, Mittelalter und Neuzeit*. Königstein 1981. Pp. 29–47.
- (1084g) R. McL. WILSON: *Jewish Literary Propaganda*. In: *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*. Paris 1978. Pp. 61–71.
- (1084h) JERRY L. DANIEL: *Anti-Semitism in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 98, 1979, pp. 45–65.

(1084i) MENAHEM STERN, ed.: *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*, vol. 1: From Herodotus to Plutarch. Jerusalem 1974. Vol. 2: From Tacitus to Simplicius. Jerusalem 1980.

MARCUS (1071) has a popular survey, derived particularly from 'Against Apion', noting the prevalence of certain anti-Jewish themes, especially the social and religious particularism of the Jews.

HOPFNER (1072) is a survey marked by anti-Semitism which draws particularly on Josephus.

ISAAC (1073) inconclusively argues the controversial thesis that pagan anti-Semitism was a relatively late phenomenon in antiquity, was not a mass movement, was by no means universal, and indeed almost limited to Egypt, especially to Alexandria. If so, we may ask, how can we account for the numerous anti-Semitic comments of Greek writers such as Posidonius and Apollonius Molo (who were not from Alexandria) and of Roman writers starting with Cicero?

I (1074) have noted that not all of the ancients were negative toward the Jews, that some of them, particularly in the early Hellenistic period, found in the Jews various praiseworthy qualities, which turn out to be the four cardinal virtues of wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice.

YOYOTTE (1075) suggests that anti-Semitism in Hellenistic Egypt has its origin in the fact that Jews had served as soldiers, and, what is more, of the hated Persians. But, we may reply, if this were so, we would expect that Josephus, in such an apologetic work as 'Against Apion', would have defended the Jews against such a charge, and this he does not do.

FARRÉ (1076) has a general popular survey of anti-Semitism, especially of the ancient period, with particular emphasis on the 'Against Apion' of Josephus.

ADRIANI (1077), in an article which is largely indebted to 'Against Apion', attempts to differentiate between the religious and political motives which, under the basically tolerant regimes of the Persian Achaemenides and the Romans, led to anti-Jewish actions.

KAHN-JASHAR (1078), in a popular summary, contrasts the pre-Christian anti-Semitism of Apion, which, he says, arose out of envy, rivalry, misunderstanding, and even ignorance, with Christian anti-Semitism, which, he says, is ideological and hence brought harsher results. In reply, we may say that he neglects economic and political causes; moreover, the Alexandrian Jewish community suffered very heavily in such pogroms as the one in 66 C.E.

SCHALIT (1079), in a brief sketch, concludes that there can be no doubt that Apion played a leading role in spreading anti-Jewish propaganda and in provoking agitation, since otherwise Josephus would not have dealt with him at such length in his 'Against Apion'; but, we may reply, by the time (93 C.E.) that Josephus wrote his work, the disturbances which Apion and others had caused in Alexandria in 40 C.E. were no longer a live issue: what was important to Josephus were the ideological charges made by Apion, since they were being repeated by such anti-Semitic writers as Tacitus in Rome of his day.

SCHALIT (1080), p. 257, commenting on the title 'Jewish Antiquities', suggests that it hints that the chief aim which Josephus set himself was to dispel the slander that the Jewish nation was not an ancient one. But, we may remark,

Josephus himself says explicitly (Ant. 1. 14) that the main lesson to be learnt from the work is that those who conform to the will of G-d prosper and that those who do not suffer disaster. The title 'Jewish Antiquities' may be explained as due to the influence of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who had written a history entitled 'Roman Antiquities', similarly in twenty books.

FINKELSTEIN (1081) argues that the charge of ass-worship made against the Jews by the Seleucid anti-Semites of Maccabean times had sufficiently spread in the third century B.C.E. under Ptolemaic rule to affect the manner in which the authors of Psalms 78 and 105 describe the ten plagues. The language of the Psalms, however, we may reply, is hardly distinctive enough to support such a conclusion. BICKERMANN (1082)(1083) and HEINEMANN (1084) had followed Josephus (Against Apion 2. 80) in ascribing this calumny to the Seleucids in their attempt to justify Antiochus Epiphanes, who allegedly found an ass' head in the Temple (Against Apion 2. 90). FINKELSTEIN asserts that this charge originated in Egypt, as seen in Manetho in the version of the Exodus of the Egyptian priests. But, we may note, Manetho nowhere refers to ass-worship: instead we may point out that Mnaseas of Patara, a disciple of Eratosthenes, who lived a generation before Antiochus, does mention an ass found in the Temple (Against Apion 2. 112–114). It is, moreover, likely that there was such a canard in the Egyptian anti-Semitic version of the Exodus from which Tacitus' Histories 5. 3–4 draws the statement that the Jews worshipped an ass because of the fact that a herd of wild asses had led Moses to a spring when they were in need of water while going through the desert after the Exodus.

HEINEMANN (1084a)(1084b) contends that Hellenistic Jewry, as seen in the writings of Philo and of Josephus, did not admit the existence of a fundamental antithesis between Judaism and heathenism. He stresses the answer of Josephus (Against Apion 2. 123) to the charge that the Jews hate the Greeks and notes that Josephus (Against Apion 2. 169) formulated the idea that the philosophers did not dare tell the whole truth to the masses. HEINEMANN emphasizes that the Jews were hated because of their successful missionary activities and self-segregation. He argues that the rabbinic apologetic differs from that of Hellenistic Jews in that it does not attempt to convert the anti-Semites, but rather to strengthen the adherence of the Jews to the teachings of their fathers. We may, however, respond by noting the pride with which the rabbis pointed out that the descendants of such arch-anti-Semites as Haman had converted to Judaism.

VISCHER (1084c), commenting on the religio-historical background of Against Apion 2. 80–114, explains that the canard that the Jews worshipped an ass may have arisen because of the similarity between the Egyptian word for ass, *yao*, and the pronunciation of the Hebrew Tetragrammaton, which, according to Diodorus (1. 94. 2) and Varro (ap. Lydus, De Mensibus 4. 53, p. 110–111), was pronounced *iao*.

BELL (1084d) concludes that the story of the elephants sent to kill the Jews is more correctly attributed by Josephus to Ptolemy VII, and that the propagandist who wrote III Maccabees adapted it to his own purpose.

FINEGAN (1084e), pp. 65–66, presents a cursory survey of the anti-Semitism that prevailed in Alexandria.

POLIAKOV (1084f) presents (pp. 19–32; pp. 3–16 in English translation) a survey of anti-Semitism in pagan antiquity, in the course of which he summarizes the charges of Apion and of other authors cited by Josephus in 'Against Apion' against the Jews, in particular their alleged leprosy, inhospitality, atheism, and missionary zeal.

WILSON (1084g) summarizes the charges of the anti-Semites mentioned by Josephus in 'Against Apion' and the answers given by Josephus. How far this propaganda had any effect is doubtful, he concludes; but, we may comment, in Alexandria, at least, intellectuals such as Apion played a major role in stimulating popular anti-Semitic outbreaks.

DANIEL (1084h) has a general discussion of the origins of Hellenistic anti-Semitism and of the charges made against the Jews. He concludes that the frequency and intensity of the disparaging remarks about Jews justifies the conclusion that anti-Semitism was more deeply ingrained and more widespread than many modern scholars would grant. We may comment that DANIEL is insufficiently critical of Josephus, whose quotations of these comments are a major source, since Josephus is quite obviously selective in his apologetic treatise against Apion. As to the other remarks, STERN's (1084i) recent collection shows that the picture is far from exclusively anti-Semitic. We may also ask whether the views of Alexandrian intellectual anti-Semites, who are the source of the most virulent statements, are really representative of the ancient world. In any case, we hear of much less anti-Semitism in Asia Minor, which had perhaps a million Jews, or Babylonia, which similarly had about a million.

### 12.13: The Hasmonean Kings Generally

- (1084j) PINKHOS CHURGIN: *Studies in the Time of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). New York 1949.
- (1084k) THEODORE N. LEWIS: *My Faith and People: Convictions of a Rabbi*. New York 1961.
- (1085) MENAHEM STERN: *Josephus Flavius' Method of Writing History* (in Hebrew). In: *Seventh Congress of the Israel Historical Society: Historians and Historical Schools*. Jerusalem 1962. Pp. 22–28.
- (1086) EDWARD R. LEVENSON: *New Tendentious Motifs in Antiquities. A Study of Development in Josephus' Historical Thought*. Diss., M. A., Columbia University, New York 1966.
- (1087) JOSHUA EPHRON: *The Hasmonean Kingdom and Simeon ben Shetaḥ* (in Hebrew). Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1962.
- (1088) K. FISCHER: *Die Herrschaft der Hasmonäer-Idee und Wirklichkeit*. Diss., Jena 1966–67.
- (1089) JAMES P. M. WALSH: *Hasmoneans*. In: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 6, 1967, pp. 943–945.
- (1090) PHILIP KIEVAL: *The Talmudic View of the Hasmonean and Early Herodian Periods in Jewish History*. Diss., Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. 1970.
- (1091) THOMAS FISCHER: *Zu den Beziehungen zwischen Rom und den Juden im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86, 1974, pp. 90–93.
- (1092) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: *The Hasmonean Dynasty*. In: *Cambridge History of Judaism* (forthcoming).

- (1092a) EDWYN ROBERT BEVAN: The Jews. In: Cambridge Ancient History 9, Cambridge 1951, pp. 397–436.
- (1092b) URIEL RAPPAPORT: The Hellenistic Cities and the Judaizing of the Land of Israel in the Hasmonean Period. In: S. PERLMAN and B. SHIMRON, ed., Doron: Jubilee Volume in Honour of Prof. Ben Zion Katz, University of Tel-Aviv, 1967, pp. 219–230. Rpt. in BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA, ed., The Seleucid Period in Eretz Israel: Studies on the Persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmonean Revolt. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 263–275.
- (1092c) MICHAEL KRUPP: Bemerkungen zur Münzgeschichte der Hasmonäer. In: Das Institutum Judaicum der Universität Tübingen in den Jahren 1971–1972 (typewritten). Tübingen 1972. Pp. 130–148.
- (1092d) SAMUEL SCHAFER: The Hasmoneans in Jewish Historiography. Diss., D.H.L., Jewish Theological Seminary, New York 1973.
- (1092e) ALYN BRODSKY: The Kings Depart: A Saga of the Empire Judah Maccabee Created and His Heirs Destroyed. New York 1974.
- (1092f) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: Hellenistic Cities of Judaea and Its Vicinity – Some New Aspects. In: B. LEVICK, ed., The Ancient Historian and His Materials. Essays in honour of C. E. Stevens on his seventieth birthday. London 1975. Pp. 59–73.
- (1092g) BEN ZION LURIE: On the Hills of Judah and Samaria in the Days of the Hasmoneans (in Hebrew). In: Ha-Ummah 14, 1975–76, pp. 366–377.
- (1092h) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Manpower, Economics, and Internal Strife in the Hasmonean State. In: H. VAN EFFENTERRE, ed., Colloques Nationaux du C. N. R. S., no. 936. Armées et Fiscalité dans le Monde Antique. Paris 1977. Pp. 167–196.
- (1092i) WOLFGANG ROTH: Galilee before Jesus. In: Explor 3, 1977, pp. 18–35.
- (1092j) JAY BRAVERMAN: Jerome as a Biblical Exegete in Relation to Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition as Seen in His *Commentary on Daniel*. Diss., Ph. D., Yeshiva University, New York 1970. Published as: Jerome's *Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 7). Washington 1978.
- (1092k) JOSEPH D. AMUSIN: The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166). In: Hebrew Union College Annual 48, 1977, pp. 123–152.
- (1092l) BEN ZION LURIA (LURIE): Comments on the 'Scroll of the Sanctuary'. In: Beth Mikra 74, 1978, pp. 370–386.
- (1092m) YIGAEEL YADIN, ed.: The Temple Scroll (in Hebrew). 3 vols. Jerusalem 1977.

CHURGIN (1084j), who is uncritically followed by LEWIS (1084k), pp. 166–169, defends the Hasmoneans, declaring that Josephus wrote with hatred against them because the Hasmoneans were a thorn in the flesh of the Romans.

STERN (1085), who is particularly concerned with Josephus' treatment of the Hasmonean kings, suggests that Josephus' chief sources for Hasmonean political history were Hellenistic treatises from which he reproduced portions without greatly changing their contents and point of view; but LEVENSON (1086) appositely suggests that the fact that Josephus (Ant. 13. 318–319) appended a passage from Strabo as a revision indicates that Josephus, though not always skilful in the integration of his material, was more than a mere compiler and did indeed have his own point of view. STERN suggests that Josephus' major source for the Hasmonean kings was Nicolaus of Damascus, who was probably anti-Hasmonean.

EPHRON (1087), arguing along the same lines, concludes that Josephus minimized the significance or even distorted the Hasmonean period because he



was so opposed to fierce Jewish nationalism and that Nicolaus, who sought to praise Herod as a loyal supporter of Roman rule, probably reviled the Hasmoneans; but, we may reply, the Hasmoneans, as depicted in Josephus, were generally supporters of the Romans, with whom they had treaties.

I have not seen FISCHER (1088).

WALSH (1089) gives a brief survey of the seven Hasmonean kings which is uncritical of Josephus.

KIEVAL (1090), who systematically compares the Talmudic literature with Josephus for this period, convincingly demonstrates that the rabbis possessed not only oral traditions but also independent historical records. The evidence, when taken as a whole, does not support the widely prevalent theory that the rabbis were opposed to the Hasmoneans and hoped to erase their memory by preserving little information about them. He notes that the rabbis at times do praise the Hasmoneans and Herod for those deeds which glorified the Temple. We may add that the Talmudic corpus is not a history book and hence contains little about any historical figures, including those, such as Julian, whose objectives they praise. As KIEVAL explains, this minimizing of historical forces is in line with the Talmudic tendency to look upon Judaism as not subject to the winds of history.

FISCHER (1091) concludes that the gradual attainment of independence by the Jews from Seleucid rule is very closely connected with the simultaneous transition to client status with Rome.

GOLDSTEIN (1092) asserts that none of the Hasmoneans were 'secularists' or 'Hellenizers', and that their patterns were entirely Jewish, being based upon their own interpretations of the Bible.

BEVAN (1092a), pp. 397–406, presents a summary of Jewish political and religious history from Aristobulus I to the rise of Herod, co-ordinating Josephus and rabbinic literature.

RAPPAPORT (1092b) contends that the goal of the Hasmoneans was to destroy and Judaize the Hellenistic cities; but we may comment that archaeological remains indicate that there was no abrupt end to these cities.

I have not seen KRUPP (1092c).

SCHAFLER (1092d) declares that Josephus was ambivalent concerning the Hasmoneans. On the one hand, he was proud of their achievements; and yet his almost complete reliance upon Hellenistic sources led him to portray the Hasmoneans as arrogant and brutal. Thus Josephus notes that Alexander Jannaeus enlarged Judaea, and yet he remarks that he was hated. Josephus' reliance upon non-Jewish sources, SCHAFLER concludes, brought his narrative into conflict with rabbinic accounts.

BRODSKY (1092e) has a popular history, in a lively style, of the Hasmonean kings. He bases himself mainly on Josephus, of whom he is only occasionally critical.

APPLEBAUM (1092f) comments that historians of the nineteenth century and during most the twentieth century regarded the Hasmoneans as destroyers of Greek urban civilization, basing themselves on Josephus' comment (War 1. 156) that Pompey liberated from Jewish rule the towns which the Jews had not al-

ready razed to the ground. APPLEBAUM, however, argues that the Hasmoneans, as able soldiers, must early have realized the tactical value of fortified towns; and, indeed, archaeology has yielded Hasmonean coins in several of the cities enumerated by Josephus, thus showing that life did not end there. We may, however, suggest that such coins may indicate only that the Jews settled there.

LURIE (1092g), dealing with the boundaries of Israel in Hasmonean times, tries to rehabilitate the Hasmonean kings and attacks modern historians for relying too much upon Josephus, who in turn was dependent upon the Gentile historian Nicolaus of Damascus.

BAR-KOCHVA (1092h) theorizes that the need to find new land reserves for the overpopulated community in the Judaeen hills, a factor which has thus far been ignored by scholars, played an important, if not a decisive, role in the campaigns of the Hasmoneans in the 'corridor' in Galilee, in the Mount Hebron region, and in the northern part of Transjordan. The fact that the Hasmoneans realized that it was important to retain a large enough population of military age in the newly occupied zone to enable it to manage on its own is BAR-KOCHVA's explanation as to why the Hasmoneans recruited mercenaries (Ant. 13. 249; War 1. 61). He concludes that the recruitment of mercenaries was forced upon the Hasmoneans by their growing military requirements and by the reluctance of Jewish farmers to join the standing army. He notes that, on the basis of Antiquities 14. 202–210, some scholars have concluded that one source of income for maintaining mercenaries was the misuse of the religious tithes; BAR-KOCHVA, however, suggests that the reference is not to the Jewish first tithe but to the Hellenistic tithe, which was the main land tax under the Seleucids. Yet, we may comment, as BAR-KOCHVA recognizes, that it is very difficult in the same work to understand the same word *δεκάτη* as referring to tithes and to Hellenistic taxes. The document here cited, moreover, states that the Hasmoneans, as priests, are entitled to the first tithe, just as was paid "to their forefathers": this cannot refer to taxes but only to tithes, which their forefathers, as priests, received. BAR-KOCHVA concludes that the maintenance of mercenaries by the Hasmoneans was financed by the abundant resources of the dynasty and did not require special unpopular taxes.

ROTH (1092i) stresses the de-Hellenization policy of the Hasmoneans, noting the elimination of Hellenistic cities as cultural centers and the reintegration of the populace into the Jewish cultic community.

BRAVERMAN (1092j), pp. 228–233 (pp. 113–116 in the printed version), notes that in his commentary on Daniel 11. 20, Jerome speaks of a Hebrew tradition that "the one most vile and unworthy of kingly honor" is Trypho, who dealt treacherously with King Antiochus VI. No extant rabbinic work gives this interpretation of the passage in Daniel. The only Jewish works which do mention Trypho are, as BRAVERMAN notes, I Maccabees 13. 31–32 and Josephus, Antiquities 13. 131–132.

AMUSIN (1092k) suggests that 4Q 169 (= 4QpNah) reflects the period of Alexander Jannaeus and Salome Alexandra, and that Ephraim, Manasseh, and Judah represent the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes.

LURIA (LURIE) (1092l), in a critique of YADIN (1092m), argues that the Temple Scroll was written only after the death of Alexander Jannaeus, that the purpose of the Hasmonean wars was not secular but rather in order to clear the land of heathen impurities, and that as a result of the constant warfare of the Hasmoneans a new class of soldier-tenant farmers arose who could not offer prayers of thanksgiving as set down in the Torah.

#### 12.14: The Alliance of the Hasmoneans with the Romans

(1092n) GAETANO DE SANCTIS: *Storia dei Romani*. Vol. 4.3. Florence 1964.

(1092o) JÖRG-DIETER GAUGER: *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik. Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im I. Makkabäerbuch*. Diss., Bonn 1975. (Bonner Biblische Beiträge, 49; Cologne 1977).

DE SANCTIS (1092n), pp. 195–196, comments on the decree of the Roman Senate pertaining to the treaty of friendship between Rome and the Hasmoneans in 139 B.C.E. (Ant. 14. 145–148).

GAUGER (1092o) concludes that Josephus changed the documentary material before him in a formal way without, however, modifying the content. He traces the history of the formal relations between Rome and Judaea. He notes that the relations between them began with a declaration of freedom of the Senate in 161–160 B.C.E. which was not binding. In 142 B.C.E. the Jews were for the first time taken into the circle of the friends and allies of Rome. In approximately 139–138 B.C.E. a letter of protection of the Senate was transmitted to the Jewish state.

#### 12.15: The Kittim of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Seleucids or Romans?

(1093) ELIEZER L. SUKENIK: *Hidden Scrolls* (in Hebrew). 2 vols. Jerusalem 1948–50.

(1094) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Scholarship and the Hoax of the Recent Discoveries*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 337–363.

(1095) KARL ELLIGER: *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*. Tübingen 1953.

(1096) GÉZA VERMÈS: *Le cadre historique des manuscrits de la Mer Morte*. In: *Recherches de Science religieuse* 41, 1953, pp. 5–29, 203–230.

(1097) CYRILLE DETAYE: *Le cadre historique du Midrash d'Habacuc*. In: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 30, 1954, pp. 323–343.

(1098) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: *The Kittim and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 88, 1956, pp. 92–109.

(1099) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: *L'Identification des Kittim avec les Romains*. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 10, 1960, pp. 448–453.

(1100) YIGAL YADIN, ed.: *The Scroll of the War of the Sons of Light against the Sons of Darkness*, trans. by BATYA and CHAIM RABIN. London 1962.

(1101) JAY BRAVERMANN: *Jerome as a Biblical Exegete in Relation to Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition as Seen in His Commentary on Daniel*. Diss., Ph. D., Yeshiva University, New York 1970. Published as: *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 7). Washington 1978.

- (1101a) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: The Teacher of Righteousness and the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 40, 1957–58, pp. 114–146.  
 (1101b) GÉZA VERMÈS: The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective. Cleveland 1978.

The mysterious Kittim of Assyria mentioned in the Habakkuk Commentary found at Qumrân are identified by SUKENIK (1093) as the Seleucids of Syria.

ZEITLIN (1094) objects that Josephus, who relates the entire history of the Jews from Antiochus to the end of the Seleucids in considerable detail, never mentions Assyria in connection with the Seleucids.

ELLIGER (1095), pp. 226ff., citing Josephus for historical background, says that it is very probable that the Habakkuk Commentary reflects the events of the first decades of pre-Herodian Roman rule, and that it arose in the period of transition to Herod.

VERMÈS (1096) identifies the Kittim with the Romans and hence assigns the composition of the Habakkuk Commentary to a period shortly before the taking of Jerusalem by the Romans between 65 and 63 B.C.E.

DETAYE (1097) likewise identifies the Kittim with the Roman legions of Lucullus and Pompey and hence dates the Commentary from 80 to 63 B.C.E.

ROWLEY (1098) identifies the Kittim as Seleucids. He comments in particular on the statement in the Habakkuk Commentary that the Kittim sacrificed to their standards, which seems to be a clear reference to the Roman cult of standards. But ROWLEY declares that War 6. 316 is the sole authority for the statement that the Romans sacrificed to their standards. We may comment, however, that Josephus, who is here describing how Titus' soldiers hailed him as *imperator*, was probably drawing upon Titus' 'Commentaries' (Life 358). It seems hardly likely that Josephus, who was so indebted to the Flavians, would misrepresent this crucial scene; and indeed he appeals (Against Apion 1. 50) to Vespasian and Titus as witnesses to the veracity of his statements about the Jewish war. ROWLEY opposes the identification of the Kittim with the Romans since, he says, this would contradict the view that the Dead Sea Sect predated Roman times; but we may reply that this reference may be to a crucial climactic event in the long history of the sect, without reference to the origin of the group.

DEL MEDICO (1099) notes that Josippon (1. 1) speaks of the Kittim in connection with the origins of Rome and that he calls Italy Kittim.

YADIN (1100), pp. 22–25, noting the places where the Kittim are mentioned in various Dead Sea Scrolls, concludes that the name Kittim could have applied both to the Greeks and to the Romans, depending on the period and on the context.

BRAVERMAN (1101), pp. 236–239 (pp. 117–118 in the printed version) notes that the midrashic tradition (Genesis Rabbah 37. 1) identifies the Kittim with Italy, and that the Targum of Onkelos, the Jerusalem Targum, and the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on Numbers 24. 24 likewise identify them with Italy. He reviews the various hypotheses concerning the identification of the Kittim in Josephus (Ant. 1. 128) and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is interesting, we may remark, that Jerome, in his Commentary on Daniel 11. 30–31, specifically

states that, according to the Jews, the Kittim of Daniel 11. 30 refer not to Antiochus Epiphanes but to the Romans, and that he, Jerome, agrees with this Jewish tradition. It is true that Josephus himself (Ant. 1. 128) says that the term originally referred to the island of Cyprus, “whence the name *Chethim* [Χεθίμ] given by the Hebrews to all islands and to most maritime countries”. We may conclude that the name Kittim had a broad connotation in Josephus’ time, but that by the time of the Targumim in the second century it had come to be restricted to Italy. Inasmuch as the Dead Sea Commentary on Habakkuk is generally dated before Josephus, the attempt to equate Kittim and Italy seems not to be proven.

ROWLEY (1101a) opposes the identification of the Kittim with the Romans. To be sure, the Dead Sea Commentary on Habakkuk speaks of the Kittim’s sacrifice to their standards; but there is no evidence that this was practiced in Republican Rome, whereas the Seleucids did practice it. Moreover, the reference to a king of Kittim precludes an identification with the Romans, since the Romans in Republican times (the date of these Scrolls) had no king. To this, however, we may object that from the point of view of outsiders, and especially those who hated them, the Romans, even under the late Republic, had many of the appearances of a totalitarian state, particularly under Sulla and Caesar. Those who object to the identification of the Kittim with the Syrians note that Josephus (Ant. 12. 293) says that the Kittim came from islands; but Josephus here says that Antiochus included mercenaries from the islands of the Aegean.

VERMÈS (1101b), pp. 148–149, noting that the Commentary on Habakkuk (1QpHab. 6. 3–5) says that the Kittim sacrifice to their standards and that Josephus (War 6. 316) says that the Romans do so, concludes that the Kittim are Romans.

## 12.16: Jonathan the Hasmonean

(1101c) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Hellenistic Warfare in Jonathan’s Campaign near Azotos. In: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 2, 1975, pp. 83–96.

(1101d) JEROME MURPHY-O’CONNOR: Demetrius I and the Teacher of Righteousness (I Macc., X, 25–45). In: *Revue Biblique* 83, 1976, pp. 400–420.

BAR-KOCHVA (1101c) notes that the most detailed description of the events in connection with the confrontation between Jonathan and Apollonius is preserved by Josephus (Ant. 13. 86–119). He remarks that the information about the battle of Azotus is based upon I Maccabees. There is no evidence that in his narrative of Jonathan’s campaign Josephus used any other source, and indeed his detailed description and ‘professional’ terminology are precisely what may be expected in a paraphrase. With regard to events connected with the struggle for power in Syria, however, Josephus derived his information from a source (or sources) well acquainted with Syrian developments of this period.

MURPHY-O’CONNOR (1101d) notes that the letter of Demetrius I to Jonathan the Hasmonean quoted in I Maccabees 10. 25–45 contains all the essential provisions of the charter accorded the Jews by Antiochus III (Ant. 12. 138–

144). There are, to be sure, certain variations in style, but these are paralleled by the letter of Antiochus III (Ant. 12. 150–152). MURPHY-O’CONNOR divides the substance of the letter (Ant. 13. 48–57) into two parts on the basis of the alternation between the personal and impersonal style.

### 12.17: Simon the Hasmonean

- (1102) FRANK M. CROSS: *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. London 1958; rev. ed., Garden City, New York 1961. Trans. into German by KLAUS BANNACH and CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: *Die antike Bibliothek von Qumran und die moderne biblische Wissenschaft*. Neukirchen-Vluyn 1967.
- (1102a) FRANK M. CROSS: *The Early History of the Qumran Community*. In: *McCormick Quarterly* 21, 1968, pp. 249–264.
- (1102b) HANS BURGMANN: ‘The Wicked Woman’: Der Makkabäer Simon? In: *Revue de Qumran* 8, 1972–1975, pp. 323–359.
- (1102c) HANS BURGMANN: *Der Gründer der Pharisäergenossenschaft. Der Makkabäer Simon*. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 9, 1978, pp. 153–191.
- (1102d) WOLF WIRGIN: *Simon Maccabaeus’ Embassy to Rome – Its Purpose and Outcome*. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 106, 1974, pp. 141–146.

CROSS (1102) identifies the impious priest of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Simon the Hasmonean (142–134 B.C.E.). We may object, however, that since Josephus (War 1. 78–80 and Ant. 13. 311–313) speaks of Judah the Essene assembling around him a great number of disciples in the reign of Aristobulus I (104–103), this is unlikely if they had been ejected by Simon a generation earlier. On such grounds the identification of the Impious Priest with Alexander Jannaeus seems more credible.

CROSS (1102a) says that Simon the Hasmonean was probably the Wicked Priest mentioned in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The death of Jonathan fits precisely with Essene comments on the violent death of the Wicked Priest, but, says CROSS, Simon fits better.

BURGMANN (1102b) identifies Simon as the Wicked Woman, the Man of Lies, the Wicked Priest, and the Lion of Wrath mentioned in the Scrolls, since he was known for his eloquence and unscrupulous demagoguery and became the leader of the group from which the Pharisees evolved. We may comment that the identification of Simon with a woman is unparalleled, and the statement that he led the party which emerged as the Pharisees disregards Josephus’ testimony, which mentions the three sects first (Ant. 13. 171) during his narrative of the reign of Jonathan the Hasmonean, Simon’s predecessor, and which elsewhere (Ant. 18. 11) declares that the three sects existed from the most ancient times.

BURGMANN (1102c) repeats this view and postulates that Simon founded the Pharisees in order to combat the Qumran sectaries. This hypothesis, he claims, fits in with the picture in Josephus and in I Maccabees of Simon as a versatile, foresighted, ambitious political realist. In answer to the objection that the Pharisees were not on good terms with the Hasmoneans, he remarks that the religious situation was unstable during this period.

WIRGIN (1102d), comparing I Maccabees 15. 15–24 and Antiquities 14. 145–149, notes that since, significantly, the letter of the Romans transmitted through the Jewish envoys says nothing about the powers hostile to the Jews, it may be assumed that it was piracy which menaced the Jews in common with all other maritime nations in the region. To be sure, we may remark, the letter specifically speaks of protecting the “country and ports”, but there is no indication in our sources that the Jews had been suffering at the hands of the admittedly widespread Mediterranean pirates; and the wording of the letter reflects the Roman concern to keep the Mediterranean free of pirates, who indeed had been most troublesome to them.

### 12.18: John Hyrcanus

- (1103) HERBERT M. J. LOEWE: “Render unto Caesar”; religious and political loyalty in Palestine. Cambridge 1940.
- (1104) ALFRED R. BELLINGER: The End of the Seleucids. In: Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 38, 1949, pp. 51–102.
- (1105) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Paris 1949; 2nd ed. by FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL and JEAN STARCKY. Paris 1961.
- (1106) MENAHEM STERN: The Relations between Judea and Rome during the Rule of John Hyrcanus (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 26, 1961, pp. 1–22.
- (1107) BEN-ZION LURIE: Changes in the Theory of Taxation in the Days of the Hasmoneans (in Hebrew). In: *Molad* 23, 1965–66, pp. 697–700.
- (1107a) JOSEPH COPPENS: Allusions historiques dans la Genèse Apocryphe. In: JOHANNES VAN DER PLOEG, ed., *La secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme*. Bruxelles 1959. Pp. 109–112.
- (1107b) RUDOLF MEYER: ‘Elia’ und ‘Ahab’ (Tg. Ps.–Jon. zu Deut. 33, 11). In: OTTO BETZ, MARTIN HENGEL, PETER SCHMIDT, edd., *Abraham Unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel* (Festschrift Otto Michel). Leiden 1963. Pp. 356–368.
- (1107c) BEN ZION LURIE: The Date of ‘Zion Uzaiah’ (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 13. 1, 1967–68, pp. 4–13.
- (1107d) BEN ZION LURIE: A Rare Coin of King Yannai (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 13. 3, 1967–68, pp. 18–19.
- (1107e) HERBERT HIRSCH: The Chronology of the Hasmonean Coinage – a New Hypothesis (in Hebrew). In: *Alon* 5, 1973–74, pp. 2–6. Trans. into English: A New Hypothesis about the Chronology of Hasmonean Coinage. In: *Shekel* 19, 1972, pp. 5–12.
- (1107f) YA’AKOV MESHORER: Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period. Tel-Aviv 1967.
- (1107g) TESSA RAJAK: *Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World*. Diss., 2 vols., Oxford 1974.
- (1107h) THOMAS FISCHER: Johannes Hyrkan I. auf Tetradrachmen Antiochos’ VII? Ein Beitrag zur Deutung der Beizeichen auf hellenistischen Münzen. In: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 91, 1975, pp. 191–196.

LOEWE (1103), commenting on Antiquities 13. 247, shows that the Jews raised no objection to having John Hyrcanus pay tribute: it was not regarded as idolatry.

BELLINGER (1104), p. 69, comments on the contradiction between the Samaritans’ appeal for help to Antiochus Cyzicenus in Antiquities 13. 276 and the appeal to Antiochus Aspendius (i.e. Antiochus VIII Grypus) in War 1. 65.

He concludes that the 'War' represents an error which is corrected in the 'Antiquities'. In general BELLINGER makes skilful use of coins to prove some of Josephus' statements (see also *Antiquities* 13. 368, 371) and to correct others.

ABEL (1105), pp. 275–276, comments on the *senatusconsultum* issued on the occasion of the embassy of Numenius (*Ant.* 14. 145–148).

STERN (1106) also investigates this Roman senatorial decree honoring Antipater and Hyrcanus which he dates in 134 B.C.E. at the beginning of Hyrcanus' rule before Antiochus Sidetes' victory over the Jews. He comments on the treaty quoted by Josephus, *Antiquities* 13. 260ff., which he explains against the backdrop of the political events of 128–125 B.C.E. He dates the decree of the people of Pergamum (*Ant.* 14. 247ff.) in 113–112 B.C.E. on the basis of literary, numismatic, epigraphical, and papyrological evidence. STERN concludes that Hyrcanus tried to maintain friendly relations with both the Romans and Ptolemies, who were linked to Roman policy in the East, these relations being favored by the considerable influence which Egyptian Jewry exerted.

LURIE (1107), co-ordinating Josephus with Talmudic texts, notes that Hyrcanus freed the 'am ha-'arez ("people of the land"), on whom taxation rested heavily and unfairly, from paying tithes, even though this went against the Torah, because of the exigencies of the time, and that the rabbis accepted this without complaint.

COPPENS (1107a) declares that he is not convinced by the attempts to find references in the Dead Sea Genesis Apocryphon to John Hyrcanus and to Alexander Jannaeus (*Ant.* 13. 139, 407).

MEYER (1107b) comments on allusions to John Hyrcanus in the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan on Deuteronomy 33. 11, in Josephus (*Ant.* 13. 288), and in the Qumran literature.

LURIE (1107c), discussing the reports in rabbinic literature and in Josephus (*Ant.* 13. 249, 16. 179, *War* 1. 61) of tombs, says that it was Johanan the high priest (135–106 B.C.E.) who was concerned with establishing the purity of Jerusalem. Hence we can set the time of the reburial of the bones of the leprous king Uzziah in his reign, toward the end of his life.

LURIE (1107d) concludes that since John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus conquered so much land, it is unlikely that Judaea did not mint coins of value. While it is true that one should not generalize from one coin, the coin here described fits in with the circumstances of John Hyrcanus, who apparently minted it while he was free of Seleucid suzerainty (*Ant.* 13. 373).

HIRSCH (1107e), on the basis of Josephus and of I and II Maccabees, contends, in opposition to MESHORER (1107f) that all coins of Johanan are those of John Hyrcanus I, and not Hyrcanus II.

I have not seen RAJAK (1107g), Appendix VII, which contains an emendation of the text of *Antiquities* 13. 262 and the interpretation of the Roman decree in favor of John Hyrcanus.

FISCHER (1107h) concludes that the monogram on certain coins of Antiochus VII is to be read as Hyrcanos, who took the silver for Antiochus from the tomb of King David (*War* 1. 61 and *Ant.* 13. 249).



## 12.19: Alexander Jannaeus

- (1108) JACOB KAPLAN: Excavations on the Yannai Line (in Hebrew). In: *Yedi'ot Ha-ḥevrah ha-ivrit lehakirat Erez-Yisrael ve-ʿatikoteha* 16, 1951, pp. 17–23.
- (1109) JACOB KAPLAN: The Yannai Line. In: *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congress of Roman Frontier Studies, 1967. Tel-Aviv 1971. Pp. 201–205.*
- (1110) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Alexander Yannai's Conquests in Moab (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 1, 1951, pp. 104–121.
- (1111) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Die Eroberungen des Alexander Jannäus in Moab. In: *Theokratia* 1, 1967–69, pp. 3–50.
- (1112) WILLY SCHOTTROFF: Horonaim, Nimrim, Luhith und der Westrand des 'Landes Ataroth'. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Topographie des Landes Moab. In: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 82, 1966, pp. 163–208.
- (1113) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Holy Land from the Persian to the Arab Conquests (536 B.C. to A.D. 640). A Historical Geography. Grand Rapids 1966 (trans. of 3rd Hebrew edition, with numerous revisions).
- (1114) RALPH MARCUS: The Name Makkabaioi. In: ABRAHAM G. DUKER et al., edd., *Joshua Starr Memorial Volume*. New York 1953. Pp. 59–65.
- (1115) BARUCH KANAEL: Notes on Alexander Jannaeus' Campaigns in the Coastal Region (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 24, 1954–55, pp. 9–15.
- (1116) BARUCH KANAEL: The Conquests of Alexander Jannaeus (in Hebrew). In: *Ma'arakhot* 30. 3, Jan. 1958, pp. 58–68.
- (1117) KURT GALLING: Die Τερπωλή des Alexander Jannäus. In: JOHANNES HEMPEL and LEONHARD ROST, edd., *Von Ugarit nach Qumran (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 77, 1958), pp. 49–62.
- (1118) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: *Josephus, vol. 7, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV* (Loeb Classical Library). London 1943.
- (1119) CHAIM RABIN: Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisees. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 7, 1956, pp. 3–11.
- (1120) BEN-ZION LURIE: *King Jannaeus* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1960.
- (1121) BEN-ZION LURIE: The Fate of the Followers of Alexander Jannaeus (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 10. 1, 1965, pp. 33–39.
- (1122) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Queen Salome and King Jannaeus Alexander. A Chapter in the History of the Second Jewish Commonwealth. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 51, 1960–61, pp. 1–33.
- (1123) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Rise and Fall of the Judaean State: A Political, Social and Religious History of the Second Commonwealth. Vol. 1.* Philadelphia 1962.
- (1124) SALOMON (= SOLOMON) ZEITLIN: *La Reine Salomé et le Roi Alexandre Jannée. In Evidences* 12, no. 87, 1961, pp. 37–42.
- (1125) MENAHEM STERN: The Political Background of the Wars of Alexander Jannai (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 33, 1963–64, pp. 325–336.
- (1126) JOSEPH NAVEH: Dated Coins of Alexander Jannaeus. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 18, 1968, pp. 20–26.
- (1127) URIEL RAPPAPORT: La Judée et Rome pendant le Règne d'Alexandre Jannée. In: *Revue des Études juives* 127, 1968, pp. 329–345.
- (1128) HAIM SCHWARZBAUM: *Studies in Jewish and World Folklore*. Berlin 1968.
- (1129) MATTHIAS DELCOR: *Les manuscrits de la mer morte. Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc*. Paris 1951.
- (1130) MOSES H. SEGAL: The Habakkuk Commentary and the Damascus Fragments (A Historical Study). In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 70, 1951, pp. 131–147.
- (1131) HANS J. SCHOEPS: Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften, 35: Die Opposition gegen die Hasmonäer. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 81, 1956, pp. 663–670.

- (1132) JOHN M. ALLEGRO: Thrakidan, the 'Lion of Wrath' and Alexander Jannaeus. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 91, 1959, pp. 47–51.
- (1133) MENAHEM STERN: Thracidas – Surname of Alexander Yannai in Josephus and Syn-cellus (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 29, 1959–60, pp. 207–209.
- (1134) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Die frühchristliche Überlieferung über die Herkunft der Familie des Herodes. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Invektive in Judäa. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 1, 1962, pp. 109–160.
- (1135) JOSEPH AMOUSSINE (AMUSSIN): Ephraïm et Manassé dans le Pêshêr de Nahum (4 Qp Nahum). In: *Revue de Qumran* 4, 1963–64, pp. 389–396.
- (1136) YITZHAK BAER: Peshêr Habbakuk and Its Period (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 34, 1969, pp. 1–42.
- (1137) LEE I. LEVINE: The Hasmonean Conquest of Strato's Tower. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 24, 1974, pp. 62–69.
- (1138) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Der Schauplatz des letzten Kampfes zwischen den aufständischen Pharisäern und Alexander Jannäus Ant 13, 379f.; Bell 1, 96). In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, ed.: *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 300–318.
- (1138a) DUNCAN HOWLETT: *The Essenes and Christianity: An Interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York 1957. Trans. into French: *Les Esséniens et le Christianisme*. Paris 1958.
- (1138b) FRANK M. CROSS: The Early History of the Qumran Community. In: *McCormick Quarterly* 21, 1968, pp. 249–264.
- (1138c) JOSEPH D. AMOUSSINE: A propos de l'interprétation de 4Q161 (fragments 5–6 et 8). In: *Revue de Qumran* 8, 1972–75, pp. 381–392.
- (1138d) BEN-ZION LURIE: From Jannaeus to Herod: Studies in the History of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1974.
- (1138e) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Manpower, Economics, and Internal Strife in the Hasmonean State. In: H. VAN EFFENTERRE, ed., *Colloques Nationaux du C. N. R. S. no. 936. Armées et Fiscalité dans le Monde Antique*. Paris 1977. Pp. 167–196.
- (1138f) MENAHEM STERN, ed.: *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Vol. 1: From Herodotus to Plutarch. Jerusalem 1974.
- (1138g) P.-E. GUILLET: Les 800 'crucifiés' d'Alexandre Jannée. In: *Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan* 100, 1977, pp. 11–16.
- (1138h) MICHAEL KRUPP: Der Konflikt Alexander Jannais mit den Pharisäern. Das Ringen um das Verständnis der Thora im Spiegel einer antiken jüdischen Münzprägung. In: *Veröffentlichungen aus dem Institut Kirche und Judentum bei der kirchlichen Hochschule Berlin*, vol. 3 (= *Treue zur Thora: Beiträge zur Mitte des christlich-jüdischen Gesprächs: Festschrift Günther Harder zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. PETER VON DER OSTEN-SACKEN). Berlin 1977. Pp. 30–35.
- (1138i) EPHRAIM URBACH: Jewish Doctrines and Practices in the Hellenistic and Talmudic Periods. In: SALO W. BARON and GEORGE S. WISE, ed., *Violence and Defense in the Jewish Experience*. Philadelphia 1977. Pp. 71–85.
- (1138j) JOSEPH D. AMUSIN: The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166). In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 48, 1977, pp. 123–152.
- (1138k) CHARLES C. TORREY: Alexander Jannaeus and the Archangel Michael. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 4, 1954, pp. 208–211.
- (1138l) JACOB LICHT: The Qumran Sect and Its Scrolls. In: *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People. 1. 8. Edd. MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 125–152, 352–360.
- (1138m) M. J. GELLER: Alexander Jannaeus and the Pharisee Rift. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 30, 1979, pp. 202–211.

KAPLAN (1108)(1109) suggests that the remains of two Hellenistic structures found in modern Tel-Aviv may be the western portions of the fortified line constructed by Alexander Jannaeus (Ant. 13. 390–391, War 1. 99–100) against Antiochus XII Dionysus; the discovery of a coin of Jannaeus at one of these supports this hypothesis.

SCHALIT (1110) concludes that for the period of Jannaeus Josephus' source is a Greek translation, partisan to the Hasmoneans, of a historical work originally in Hebrew which, like I Maccabees, was worked over with prooftexts. He argues that Josephus (Ant. 13. 397 and 14. 18) parallels the names of the places in Moab in the Septuagint version of the prophecies in Isaiah (15. 4–9) and Jeremiah (31. 3–5, 8, 34, 36), and that Josephus' immediate source was a poem praising Jannaeus' exploits in the language of the Bible and attempting to show that the prophecies were fulfilled by Jannaeus. He contends that the list in Antiquities 13. 397 is actually identical with the list in 14. 18 and that the apparently different names are mostly variant forms. The lists cannot, consequently, be used as a historical source. He concludes that Jannaeus' conquests were confined to Moab and did not extend to the Negev, where, he claims, the Nabataeans were too powerful to be conquered. SCHALIT (1111) elaborates this thesis in a second article.

SCHOTTROFF (1112) disputes SCHALIT's theory that the lists were influenced by the names in Isaiah and Jeremiah because, he says, Josephus has names that are not found there. Moreover, we may add, the discrepancies between the two lists may most easily be explained by the hypothesis that Josephus had two separate sources. The fact, however, that there are differences in spelling between Josephus' lists and those in the Septuagint would indicate that Josephus' source was not based on the Septuagint in any of the texts currently extant. The simplest explanation for the few agreements between Josephus and the passages in Isaiah and Jeremiah is, we may suggest, that both the prophets and Josephus are speaking of cities in Moab; and inasmuch as the chief cities in Moab had not changed much in several hundred years there are some duplications. In any case, even if SCHALIT's thesis is valid, it does not, as AVI-YONAH (1113) notes, invalidate the fact of Jannaeus' conquest of Moab; it would merely cast doubt on the identification of the particular cities which he had conquered.

MARCUS (1114), drawing on SCHALIT's hypothesis, suggests a novel theory that the origin of the name Μακκαβαῖος (Hebrew Maccabee) is the Hebrew word *mikveh* ("source of hope"), arguing that three of the five Biblical occurrences of *mikveh* occur in Jeremiah, which, if we accept SCHALIT's hypothesis, was particularly popular in this period. MARCUS' theory is flimsy, however, since, even if SCHALIT's hypothesis is valid, it hardly proves anything more than that one author used either Isaiah or Jeremiah or both for the one passage in his history.

KANAEL (1115), in a noteworthy co-ordination of the evidence from Josephus and from coins, concludes that Jannaeus succeeded in conquering Gaza because Hyrcanus' conquest of Idumaea had led the Nabataeans to take more southerly routes for their caravans, thus in effect abandoning Gaza. Ascalon, he further suggests, helped Jannaeus to conquer her neighbor and rival Gaza. If

Jannaeus failed to conquer Ptolemais (Acre) it was because she was able to receive help from Cyprus and the cities of Phoenicia. KANAEL (1116) also has a popular survey of the same subject.

GALLING (1117) comments on the work of art called *τερπωλή* ('delight'), which Aristobulus presented to Pompey and which had the name of "Alexander king of the Jews" (presumably Alexander Jannaeus) inscribed on it (Ant. 14. 35). He derives the word *τερπωλή* from a Semitic root, *trpl*, which would refer to a fresh planting by a Phoenician, an allusion to something similar to the garden of Adonis, since indeed Josephus says that it was either a vine or a garden (*κῆπος*). But, we may remark, it seems hardly likely that Jannaeus or Aristobulus would so openly flout Jewish religious sensibilities by presenting something reminiscent of the garden of Adonis. If Strabo, whom Josephus here quotes, says that they, that is the Jews, call it a *τερπωλή*, this would seem to be, as MARCUS (1118) (ad loc.) notes, his translation of 'eden, which indeed does mean 'delight': the representation presumably was a portrayal of the paradise of the Garden of Eden.

RABIN (1119), supporting his case with references to the Slavonic Josephus, argues that Josephus does not identify the Jewish opponents of Jannaeus as Pharisees, and that he wishes merely to depict popular fury rather than party intrigues. We may reply, however, that Antiquities 13. 398–406 shows that the Pharisees were his enemies, and it is apparent that a revolt of such magnitude as described by Josephus could not have been carried out without the initiative and support of the Pharisees.

LURIE (1120) presents, in effect, an apology for Jannaeus. He asserts that Josephus' chief source for his reign was Nicolaus of Damascus, who, he says, was prejudiced against Jannaeus because he had confused him with other kings; but, we may comment, this may be more easily explained by the jealousy which Herod, a non-Hasmonean, felt toward his Hasmonean predecessors. LURIE states that Josephus' account of Jannaeus' persecution of the Pharisees must be read with caution since we have only the Pharisaic account, and that when he is called Jannaeus 'the wicked', this is merely a synonym for 'Sadducee'. LURIE charges that Josephus' account of Jannaeus is blacker than black; but, we may note, the fact that Josephus, like the rabbis, describes the later reconciliation of Jannaeus and the Pharisees and the splendid eulogies and burial accorded him by the Pharisees (Ant. 13. 405–406) more than restores balance to the picture. LURIE (1121), comparing Josephus with the Talmudic account, repeats his charge that Josephus is presenting the Sadducean point of view.

ZEITLIN (1122), in an article which became a chapter in his book (1123), argues that the civil war of Jannaeus was basically a struggle between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, who had become involved in politics. In a popular summary, ZEITLIN (1124) attacks Queen Salome, charging that she was preoccupied with her selfish interest rather than with that of the state.

STERN (1125), using numismatic evidence to good advantage, concludes that Jannaeus' maximum territorial expanse was reached after his victory over the Nabataeans. He remarks that Josephus' sources, notably Nicolaus of Damascus, were hostile to Jannaeus and hence completely ignored the victory.

NAVEH (1126) deduces from the unusual fact that Jannaeus struck coins with Aramaic inscriptions that he was attempting to appease the masses toward the end of his reign by speaking to them in their own language. Josephus (Ant. 13. 393–404, War 1. 105–106) says that after his successful campaign in Transjordan the people welcomed him despite their earlier opposition to him. NAVEH plausibly conjectures that this reversal was due not merely to his military successes but to other acts as well, which he did to appease the people.

RAPPAPORT (1127) conjectures as to why there is no mention of an alliance between Jannaeus and the Romans and only of alliances of the Romans with John Hyrcanus (Ant. 13. 260–265) and with Hyrcanus II (Ant. 14. 202–210), and suggests that this was due not to the fact that the political decline of the Seleucids made such an alliance unnecessary but rather to the rise of Mithridates and the pirates as powers in the East and the fact that an alliance with Rome no longer had much value. While this is *a priori* plausible, we must, however, comment that there is no indication in Josephus that Jannaeus had repudiated the alliance made by his predecessor and that, in general, the successor kings of Judaea honored the commitments of their predecessors. If the treaty was negotiated by John Hyrcanus II it was only to modify certain provisions.

SCHWARZBAUM (1128) notes that the pelting of Jannaeus by the Jewish people with citrons (Ant. 13. 372) during the festival of Tabernacles is a motif that has a number of parallels in world folklore; but, of course, this does not repudiate the historicity of the event.

There have been a number of attempts to find references to Jannaeus in the Dead Sea Scrolls. DELCOR (1129) argues that the wicked priest in the Habakkuk Commentary is Jannaeus, as seen in the references to his drunkenness (Ant. 13. 398). He identifies the Dead Sea sect with the Pharisees, who were Jannaeus' bitter enemies. The charge of drunkenness, we may reply, is hardly sufficiently distinctive to identify the wicked priest, especially since such a charge is not infrequently made against delinquent priests from Biblical days on. Moreover, to identify the sect with the Pharisees is to ignore the eventual complete reconciliation that Jannaeus effected with them; and there would hardly be much point, in documents written, in all probability, some time after Jannaeus' death, in belaboring his earlier opposition without noting that he had acknowledged his error at the end of his life.

SEGAL (1130), in a suggestion that seems premature, identifies the Dead Sea sectaries with the Jewish extremists who took the desperate measure of inviting the Syrian king Demetrius Acaerus (Eucærus) into Judaea to liberate it from Jannaeus (War 1. 92–95; cf. Ant. 13. 376–379). Independently of DELCOR, he identifies the Wicked Priest of the Scrolls as Jannaeus; he furthermore identifies the mysterious Kittim as the Romans.

SCHOEPS (1131) also notes the correspondence between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Josephus with regard to Jannaeus (War 1. 96–98; Ant. 13. 379–383); Josephus (Ant. 14. 44–45), he says, parallels the Psalm of Solomon 17. 5–6.

ALLEGRO (1132), in the light of a Hebrew phrase in the Nahum commentary in the Dead Sea Scrolls which he takes to mean 'the Lion of Wrath'

and which he identifies, though with only the vaguest of evidence, as an epithet of Alexander Jannaeus, interprets Jannaeus' epithet Θρακίδας in Antiquities 13. 383 as θῆρ (τῶν) ἀκίδων ('beast of the barbs'). STERN (1133), however, rightly supports the traditional view that Jannaeus' surname Θρακίδας refers to the well-known cruelty of the Thracians, who served in armies as mercenaries in the days of Herod and who appear in papyri and inscriptions of this period, rather than to the lion of wrath in the Nahum commentary.

SCHALIT (1134) asserts that the insulting epithet Θρακίδας is an allusion not only to Jannaeus' cruelty but also to the mixing of barbarian blood in his veins.

AMOUSSINE (1135) identifies the Lion of Wrath in the Dead Sea Nahum Commentary with Jannaeus. He furthermore identifies Manasseh and Ephraim with the Sadducees and the Pharisees (Ant. 13. 399–411) and notes that the community at Qumran stood in opposition to both the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

BAER (1136) rejects, though there is no evidence to the contrary, as atrocity propaganda the historicity of the story that Jannaeus (Ant. 13. 334) crucified his enemies before his very eyes. Josephus' style, he says, betrays an anti-Semitic Hellenistic source. He asserts, on surer ground, that there is no connection between Josephus' account of Jannaeus and the Nahum commentary, though few will follow him in dating this scroll as belonging to the late Roman Empire.

LEVINE (1137) notes the discrepancy between Josephus, who (Ant. 13. 324–327) says that Strato's Tower was acquired by payment, and Megillath Ta'anith (HANS LICHTENSTEIN, ed., *Die Fastenrolle*. In: Hebrew Union College Annual 8–9, 1931–32, pp. 257–258), which says that it was acquired by actual conquest. LEVINE notes the parallel with regard to Scythopolis: War. 1. 66 implies an armed conquest, whereas Antiquities 13. 280 says that John Hyrcanus paid Antiochus VII for the rights to the city. Both there and here LEVINE concludes that both means were employed.

SCHALIT (1138) identifies the site, Bethoma (Ant. 13. 380) or Bemeselis (War 1. 96), where Jannaeus besieged his Jewish opponents as Βεσελεμίν, the Greek version of the Aramaic *bešēlamin* (the copyists in War 1. 96 inverted the consonants), a stronghold on Mount Karantal near Sameris. We may suggest that trying to reconstruct the Aramaic equivalents for other place-names in Josephus will yield further such discoveries.

HOWLETT (1138a), passim and especially pp. 70–72, cites Josephus in corroboration of his hypothesis identifying the Wicked Priest of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Alexander Jannaeus.

CROSS (1138b) gives up his earlier view that the Wicked Priest was Alexander Jannaeus, since the strife in Jannaeus' time was between the Pharisees (rather than the Dead Sea Sect) and the Hasmonean house.

AMOUSSINE (1138c) declares that the historical background for 4Q161 is probably the campaign of Ptolemy IX (Soter II) Lathyrus, which began at Acco (which is mentioned here by name, the only instance in the Qumran biblical commentaries where a geographical reference has concrete, historical signif-

icance) and continued through Judaea. This occurred during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus; and just as the campaign of the Assyrian king Sennacherib, which is alluded to in the Qumran text here, so that of Ptolemy was miraculously halted (Ant. 13. 321–327).

LURIE (1138d), relying primarily upon the Talmud, attempts to rehabilitate Jannaeus, declaring that he was not inclined to Hellenization, that he removed idol-worship, and that he was true to the Torah. Hence he should be termed not Jannaeus the Wicked King but Jannaeus the Sadducee.

BAR-KOCHVA (1138e), pp. 191–194, opposes the view of STERN (1138f), p. 225, that there was an early Jewish majority in Galilee. He remarks that the anecdote about Jannaeus' banishment to Galilee by his father (Ant. 13. 322) cannot be taken to indicate an early Jewish dense settlement in the region. The story, he says, is undoubtedly drawn from Nicolaus of Damascus and is inspired by the Oedipus myth. It indicates merely that Galilee was regarded as a desolate place. To be sure, Asochis, in Lower Galilee, which was invaded by Ptolemy Lathyrus at the beginning of Jannaeus' reign (Ant. 13. 337), was Jewish; but Josephus' statement about the enslavement of 10,000 inhabitants is suspect because it was drawn from one of the sources which wildly exaggerated the number of Jewish casualties in the battle near Asophon fought by Jannaeus (Ant. 13. 337, 344, 347). We may, however, comment that the very fact that Josephus could speak of such a large number of Jewish prisoners taken in Galilee indicates that there was a tradition that the Jewish population at that time was very large.

GUILLET (1138g), attempting to answer the question whether crucifixion was practiced by Jews and hence whether the Jews would have crucified Jesus, concludes that nothing in Josephus' account (Ant. 13. 380; War 1. 97–99) indicates that Jannaeus had eight hundred Jews crucified. Rather, Josephus' use of the verb ἀνασταυρώω suggests impalement as the method of punishment; and this is, indeed, the meaning of the verb in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Plato.

KRUPP (1138h) uses the evidence of coins that are stamped over with high priestly references as an indication that Jannaeus insisted that he had a right to the high priesthood. The coins, he adds, show that Jannaeus did not succumb to Hellenism and thus did not depart from the tradition of his father but was true to the Torah. We may comment, however, that coins are official propaganda and do not necessarily reflect the true feelings of a monarch.

URBACH (1138i), pp. 78–83, concludes that Josephus' account (Ant. 13. 372) of the pelting of Jannaeus with citrons by his Jewish adversaries is supported by the Talmudic sources (Kiddushin 66a).

AMUSIN (1138j) identifies the 'fierce lion' in the Dead Sea Commentary on the Book of Nahum (4Q169 = 4QNah) as Alexander Jannaeus.

TORREY (1138k), commenting on the fact (Ant. 13. 352–355) that, after first deciding to invade Judaea, Cleopatra eventually was dissuaded by her Jewish commander Ananias and even formed an alliance with the Jewish king Alexander Jannaeus, notes that, according to the Book of Enoch 90. 13, this change of heart was due to divine intervention, when the Archangel Michael descended to help the ram (i.e. Jannaeus).

LICHT (1138l) concludes that the Lion of Wrath in the Dead Sea Nahum Commentary is Jannaeus and that it seems very probable that the Wicked Priest is another ruler of the dynasty.

GELLER (1138m) notes that while Josephus (Ant. 13. 288–297) says that it was John Hyrcanus who ostracized the Pharisees, the Talmud (Kiddushin 66a) says that it was Alexander Jannaeus. GELLER contends that the weight of evidence indicates that the reign of Jannaeus was a more appropriate setting for a rift with the Pharisees. He notes that the language of Kiddushin 66a is extremely archaic, preserving five instances of the *waw*-conversive, thus suggesting that the passage is an extract from an ancient document. We may comment that the *waw*-conversive had long since fallen out of use, and its appearance here must be regarded as a deliberate archaism which can have little value for dating the document.



## 13: Josephus as Historian of the Roman Period (from Pompey until Herod)

### 13.0: The Roman Period: General

- (1139) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Roman Administration in Palestine (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1937.
- (1140) GERHARD J. D. AALDERS: Het romeinsche imperium en het Nieuwe Testament. Kampen 1938; 2nd ed., 1962.
- (1141) URBAN HOLZMEISTER: *Historia aetatis Novi Testamenti* (Institutiones biblicae, ser. 2). 2nd ed., Roma 1938. Trans. into Italian by C. ZEDDA: *Storia dei tempi del Nuovo Testamento*. Torino 1950.
- (1142) BENJAMIN PIN: Essai sur les origines de la guerre de Bar Kochba et la rivalité judéo-romaine en Méditerranée orientale. Diss., Paris 1938. Published as: Jérusalem contre Rom; un duel pour l'hégémonie en Méditerranée Orientale. Paris 1938.
- (1143) MOSES ABERBACH: Palestine under Roman Administration, 6–66 C.E. Diss., M.A., Leeds 1947.
- (1144) MOSES ABERBACH: The Conflicting Accounts of Josephus and Tacitus Concerning Cumanus' and Felix' Terms of Office. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 40, 1949–50, pp. 1–14.
- (1145) MOSES ABERBACH: The Roman-Jewish War (66–70 A.D.): Its Origin and Consequences. London 1966.
- (1146) ROBERT H. PFEIFFER: *History of New Testament Times*. New York 1949.
- (1147) WERNER FÖRSTER: *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, vol. 1: *Das Judentum Palästinas zur Zeit Jesu und der Apostel*. Berlin 1940. Trans. into English by GORDON E. HARRIS: *Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times*. Edinburgh 1964.
- (1148) GERALD M. FITZGERALD: Palestine in the Roman Period, 63 B.C.–A.D. 324. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 88, 1956, pp. 38–48.
- (1149) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *A Jewish Understanding of the New Testament*. Cincinnati 1956; 2nd ed., New York 1960.
- (1150) ETHELBERT STAUFFER: *Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* (Dalp-Taschenbücher, 331). Bern 1957.
- (1151) MEREDITH F. ELLER: *The Beginnings of the Christian Religion. A Guide to the History and Literature of Judaism and Christianity*. New York 1958.
- (1152) FREDERICK C. GRANT: *Ancient Judaism and the New Testament*. New York 1959; 2nd ed., Edinburgh 1960.
- (1153) JOÃO MEHLMANN: *História da Palestina nos tempos do Novo Testamento*. In: *Revista de História*, vol. 20, year 11, no. 42, 1960, pp. 351–393; vol. 21, year 11, no. 43, 1960, pp. 49–104; vol. 21, year 11, no. 44, 1960, pp. 337–368; vol. 22, year 12, no. 45, 1961, pp. 29–82; vol. 22, year 12, no. 46, 1961, pp. 303–344; vol. 23, year 12, no. 47, 1961, pp. 9–57; vol. 24, year 13, no. 50, 1962, pp. 301–351; vol. 25, year 13, no. 52, 1962, pp. 313–350; vol. 27, year 14, no. 56, 1963, pp. 311–339. Rpt.: São Paulo 1961–66, 2 vols.
- (1154) EDWARD M. BLAIKLOCK: *The Century of the New Testament*. London 1962.

- (1155) HENRI DANIEL-ROPS: *La vie quotidienne en Palestine au Temps de Jesus Christ*. Paris 1961. Trans. into English by PATRICK O'BRIAN: *Daily Life in Palestine at the Time of Christ*. London 1962. Trans. into German by SIGRID STAHLMANN: *Er kam in sein Eigentum. Die Umwelt Jesu*. Stuttgart 1963. Trans. into Swedish by SVEN STOLPE: *Dagligt liv i Palestina på Jesu tid*. Stockholm 1964. Trans. into Dutch by B. KARSTEN VAN ROSSEM: *Her dagelijks leven in Palestina ten tijde van Jezus*. Utrecht 1965. Trans. into Polish by JANINA LASOCKA. Poznań 1965. Trans. into Spanish by R. ANAYA: *La vida cotidiana en Palestina en tiempo de Jesús*. Barcelona 1965.
- (1156) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu. Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*. Leipzig 1923; 3rd. ed., Göttingen 1962. Trans. into French (based on 3rd. ed.) by JEAN LEMOYNE: *Jérusalem au temps de Jésus, recherches d'histoire économique et sociale pour la période néotestamentaire*. Paris 1967. Trans. into English (based on 3rd ed.) by F. H. and C. H. CAVE: *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus; An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Philadelphia 1969.
- (1157) FLOYD V. FILSON: *A New Testament History: The Story of the Emerging Church*. Philadelphia 1964; London 1965. Trans. into German by FRANZ J. SCHIERSE: *Geschichte des Christentums in neutestamentlicher Zeit*. Düsseldorf 1967.
- (1158) BRUCE M. METZGER: *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*. Nashville 1965.
- (1159) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: *Jews and Romans in the Early Empire*. In: *History Today* 15, 1965, pp. 232–239, 313–319.
- (1160) NORMAN KOTKER, in consultation with FREDERICK C. GRANT: *The Holy Land in the Time of Jesus (Caravel Series)*. New York 1967; London 1968. Trans. into French by ROBERT GARMARD: *En Terre sainte aux siècles de Jésus*. Paris s. a. [1967?].
- (1161) ROBERT W. CRAPPS, EDGAR V. MCKNIGHT, and DAVID A. SMITH: *Introduction to the New Testament*. New York 1969.
- (1162) CHARLES GUIGNEBERT: *Le Monde Juif vers le temps de Jésus*. Paris 1935, 1950, 1969 (with supplementary bibliography by BERNARD JAY. Trans. into English by SAMUEL H. HOOKE: *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus*. London 1939; New Hyde Park, New York 1959.
- (1163) JOHN L. MCKENZIE: *The Jewish World in New Testament Times*. In: REGINALD C. FULLER, ed., *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. London 1969. Pp. 766–783.
- (1164) KURT SCHUBERT: *Die Kultur der Juden, I: Israel im Altertum*. Frankfurt am Main 1970. Pp. 124–253, especially pp. 182–200: *Die Dynastie des Herodes und die Herrschaft Roms bis 70 n. Chr.*
- (1165) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: *Behind the New Testament*. In: *Greece and Rome* 17, 1970, pp. 81–99.
- (1166) CLEMENS THOMA: *Judentum und Hellenismus im Zeitalter Jesu*. In: *Bibel und Leben* 11, 1970, pp. 151–159.
- (1166a) MENAHEM STERN: *The Status of Provincia Judaea and Its Governors in the Roman Empire under the Julio-Claudian Dynasty (in Hebrew)*. In: *Ereẓ-Israel* 10, 1971, pp. 274–282.
- (1167) MENAHEM STERN: *The Province of Judaea*. In: SAMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, ed., in co-operation with DAVID FLUSSER and WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK, *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions (MARINUS DE JONGE and SAMUEL SAFRAI, edd., Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, vol. 1)*. Assen 1974. Pp. 308–376.
- (1168) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: *The Legal Status of the Jewish Communities in the Diaspora; The Organization of the Jewish Communities in the Diaspora*. In: SAMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, ed., in co-operation with DAVID FLUSSER and WILLEM C.

VAN UNNIK, *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (MARINUS DE JONGE and SAMUEL SAFRAI, edd., *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, vol. 1). Assen 1974. Pp. 464–503.

- (1169) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Rise and Fall of the Judaeon State*. Vol. 3: 66 C.E.–120 C.E. Philadelphia 1978.
- (1169a) ELIEZER PALTIEL: *From Protectorate to Empire: A Study of Roman Policy in Judaea and Other Ethnic States in the Eastern Provinces of the Empire from ca. 14 to ca. 73 C.E.* Diss., University of Pennsylvania. Philadelphia 1976.
- (1169b) MAX BRÜCKLMEIER: *Beiträge zur rechtlichen Stellung der Juden im römischen Reich*. Diss., Munich 1939. Published: Speyer 1939.
- (1169c) THOMAS ROBERT S. BROUGHTON: *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 2 vols. New York 1951–52. Supplement 1960.
- (1169d) LEONIDAS J. PHILIPPIDIS: *Historia tēs epochēs tēs kainēs Diathēkēs*. Athens 1958.
- (1169e) RENÉE NEHER-BERNHEIM: *Le judaïsme dans le monde romain. Textes latins commentés*. Paris 1959.
- (1169f) BUNZO AIZAWA: *Galilee in the Times of Jesus* (in Japanese). In: *Hirosakidaigaku jinmon shakai*, no. 33, March 1964, pp. 1–24.
- (1169g) PIETER J. SIJPESTEIJN: *Mithradates' March from Pergamum to Alexandria in 48 B.C.* In: *Latomus* 24, 1965, pp. 122–127.
- (1169h) SALVATORE ALESSANDRÌ: *La presunta cacciata dei Giudei da Roma nel 139 a.Cr.* In: *Studi Classici e Orientali* 17, 1968, pp. 187–198.
- (1169i) JOHN R. DONAHUE: *Tax Collectors and Sinners: An Attempt at Identification*. In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33, 1971, pp. 39–61.
- (1169j) GEDALIAH ALLON: *The Attitude of the Pharisees toward Roman Rule and the Herodian Dynasty* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 3, 1935, pp. 300–322.
- (1169k) DANIELA PIATTELLI: *Ricerche intorno alle relazioni politiche tra Roma e l'ἔθνος τῶν Ἰουδαίων dal 161 a.C. al 4 a.C.* In: *Bulletino dell'Istituto di Dritto Romano* 74, 1971, pp. 219–340.
- (1169l) THOMAS FISCHER: *Zum jüdischen Verfassungsstreit vor Pompejus* (Diodor 40,2). In: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 91, 1975, pp. 46–49.
- (1169m) ALFRED MERTENS: *Chronological Guide through the Times Round Jesus from 63 B.C.: Pompey occupied Jerusalem, till 70 A.D.: Titus burned the Temple*. Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 1–32.
- (1169n) GEZA VERMES: *Ancient Rome in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature*. In his: *Post-Biblical Studies* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 8). Leiden 1975. Pp. 215–224.
- (1169o) E. MARY SMALLWOOD: *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 20). Leiden 1976.
- (1169p) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: *Judaea as a Roman Province; the Countryside as a Political and Economic Factor*. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2. 8, 1977, pp. 355–396.
- (1169q) HEINZ KREISSIG: *Die landwirtschaftliche Situation in Palästina vor dem jüdischen Krieg*. In: *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 17, 1969, pp. 223–254.
- (1169r) ALFRED R. C. LEANEY and JACOB NEUSNER: *The Roman Era*. In: JOHN H. HAYES and J. MAXWELL MILLER, *Israelite and Judaeon History*. Philadelphia 1977. Pp. 605–677.
- (1169s) RICHARD D. SULLIVAN: *The Dynasty of Judaea in the First Century*. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. Vol. 2. 8, 1977, pp. 296–354.
- (1169sa) GUY FAU: *Le Dossier juif. Rome contre les Juifs*. Paris 1967. Trans. into Spanish: *Judaísmo y antijudaísmo*. Buenos Aires 1969.
- (1169sb) NAHUM N. GLATZER: *The Concept of Peace in Classical Judaism. The Search for Peace*. In: *Festgabe für Adolf Leschnitzer*. Heidelberg 1961. Pp. 27–38. Rpt. in his:

Essays in Jewish Thought (Judaic Studies Series, 8). University, Alabama 1978. Pp. 36–47.

- (1169sc) HENRY MARSH (Saklatvala, Beram): *The Rebel King: The Story of Christ as Seen against the Historical Conflict between the Roman Empire and Judaism*. Edinburgh 1975.
- (1169sd) GIUSEPPE SCARPAT: *Il pensiero religioso di Seneca e l'ambiente ebraico e cristiano* (Antichità classica e cristiana, 14). Brescia 1977.
- (1169se) GÜNTER STEMBERGER: *Das klassische Judentum. Kultur und Geschichte der rabbinischen Zeit (70 n. Chr. bis 1040 n. Chr.)*. München 1979.
- (1169sf) BARBARA E. THIERING: *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology and Religion, 1). Sydney 1979.

SCHALIT (1139) stresses that Palestine was part of the Roman Empire and hence that it was similar to other portions of the Empire in political, juridical, and administrative matters.

AALDERS (1140) presents a popular survey which includes the findings of the most recent scholarship; the second edition is somewhat abridged.

HOLZMEISTER (1141), especially pp. 6–11, presents a balanced view of Josephus' value and of Josephus' sources, listing Josephus' errors but also noting the tendency of recent archaeological discoveries to confirm him.

PIN (1142) includes chapters, largely based on Josephus, on the geographical distribution of Jews in the Diaspora, on the propagation of Judaism, on the role of the Diaspora, and on the ideological antagonism between Judaism and the pagan Graeco-Roman world. He tends, however, to overrate Josephus' reliability as a source.

The most original parts of ABERBACH'S (1143) dissertation have been published separately (1144)(1145).

PFEIFFER (1146) is a good handbook with useful bibliography. He has, pp. 207–210, a clear summary of Josephus' works and a brief but sound discussion of his sources.

FÖRSTER (1147) has a considerable historical introduction, especially on the Hasmoneans, on Herod and his successors, on the procurators, and on the fall of Jerusalem.

FITZGERALD (1148) has a cursory and unoriginal summary, particularly of the Herodian period, especially from the point of view of archaeology.

SANDMEL (1149) has a chapter, pp. 18–31, largely based on Josephus, written in a simple and popular but critical style on the Jewish background of the New Testament.

STAUFFER (1150) has a popular account dealing particularly with Jewish religious movements at the time of Jesus.

ELLER (1151) is an unreliable textbook with such blatant errors as the statement that Josephus has an extended reference to Jesus in the 'Antiquities' and that much of his evidence in the 'Testimonium Flavianum' may be discounted because of Josephus' later conversion to Christianity.

GRANT (1152) has a helpful survey of modern research and is very sympathetic to Judaism, but he is uncritical in his use of Josephus.

MEHLMANN (1153) is a thorough and scholarly history of the period which is carefully annotated; it has a balanced survey of Josephus' credibility in volume 20, pp. 370–380 (pp. 24–34 in book form).

BLAIKLOCK (1154) presents a brief introductory survey but maintains an independent point of view.

DANIEL-ROPS (1155) is a general survey which shows a healthy skepticism toward the figures in Josephus.

JEREMIAS (1156), in a standard work, is an investigation of economic and social conditions in the New Testament period; the English version contains extensive revisions made by the author up to 1967.

FILSON (1157), though an introductory work, is well aware of the scholarly literature and takes stands on disputed questions.

METZGER (1158) has a general introductory summary, usually following the consensus of scholarship; he emphasizes the cultural and religious background of Palestinian Judaism.

SMALLWOOD (1159), in a popular survey, stresses that the Romans followed a policy of toleration. She says that even from Josephus' pro-Jewish narrative it is clear that the Jews were often in the wrong; but, we may object, Josephus is more pro-Roman than pro-Jewish.

KOTKER's (1160) beautifully illustrated work is especially designed for young people.

CRAPPS-McKNIGHT-SMITH (1161) is intended for the elementary student.

GUIGNEBERT (1162), in the second edition of 1950, treating the political and religious history of first-century Palestine, has a critical summary of the life and works of Josephus with a balanced critique of Josephus but concludes that he was more a victim of circumstances than a traitor.

McKENZIE (1163) is a general survey, especially of religious movements and beliefs.

SCHUBERT (1164) has a popular survey, which argues that Josephus must be viewed with great skepticism when he says that the revolutionaries against Rome stood close spiritually to the Pharisees. But, we may comment, inasmuch as Josephus himself was a Pharisee, he had no reason for maligning the Pharisees; on the contrary, his point is that the revolutionaries were in all other respects 'orthodox' except in their view that G-d alone was their king. The statement in War 2. 118 that the sect founded by Judas the Galilean had nothing in common with the others is clearly an exaggeration (cf. Antiquities 18. 23).

SMALLWOOD (1165) has a popular survey of the Jewish history of Palestine for the period from 63 B.C.E.

THOMA (1166) has a very brief survey presenting Josephus as a Hellenistic Jewish opportunist. He shows that Judaism and Hellenism of the period of Jesus were two extraordinary, dynamic, alternately attracting and repelling, religious and political poles.

STERN (1166a) notes that at first the governors of Judaea were of Italian extraction, but that later they were of Graeco-Oriental origins. He comments also on the relationship of the procurators to the governors of Syria.

STERN (1167) presents a well-documented survey.

APPLEBAUM (1168) presents a carefully balanced survey of the Diaspora during the Roman period, in which he correctly warns that what is true for Alexandria, so far as the citizenship of the Jews is concerned, does not necessarily apply to other cities, though he admits that Josephus' statements do not inspire overmuch confidence. In particular, APPLEBAUM focusses on the Jewish communal organization of Sardis (Ant. 14. 259ff.) and Cyrenaica and makes good use of the epigraphical evidence.

ZEITLIN (1169), before his death in 1976, prepared a systematic, analytical account of this period.

PALTIEL (1169a) concludes that there is a significant parallel between Judaea and other native states and that provincial policy depended to a large degree upon Roman politics and political parties rather than upon the whim of individual officials. The party of Antonia and her descendants usually maintained friendly ties with native aristocracies. Both in Rome and in the provinces there was a party which favored a 'federalist' policy of granting much local autonomy, but under Claudius this party lost influence. The native rebellions which followed aimed at local autonomy rather than at independence. They were not exclusively the work of the lower classes. In Judaea the rebels at first were led by men of status who were pro-Roman. PALTIEL concludes that the conflict between the ethnic groups (including the Jews) and the *pax Romana* was not irreconcilable. We may comment, however, that such a reconstruction fails to give sufficient weight to the messianic aspect of the revolt which caught up the masses of the Jews (though it is suppressed by Josephus) and which required an independent Judaea.

I have not seen BRÜCKLMEIER (1169b).

BROUGHTON (1169c) frequently refers to Josephus' evidence in his systematic discussion, year by year, of the Roman magistrates.

I have not seen PHILIPPIDES (1169d).

NEHER-BERNHEIM (1169e) has a French translation and very brief commentary on War 2. 119–120, 122, 124–129, 131–132 (pp. 129–130); War 5. 24–26 (pp. 47–48); War 6. 238–266 (pp. 50–52); Antiquities 14. 61–74 (pp. 24–25); Ant. 14. 306–308 (p. 114); Ant. 18. 81–84 (p. 77); Ant. 20. 34–35, 49–53, 75–76, 92–95 (pp. 122–123); Ant. 20. 195–196 (pp. 112–113); Life 16 (p. 113).

I have not seen AIZAWA (1169f).

SIJPESTEIJN (1169g), comparing War 1. 187–192 and Antiquities 14. 128–136 with the parallel accounts in Hirtius' *Bellum Alexandrinum*, 26–31, and in Dio Cassius 42, 41–43, concludes that Josephus is mistaken in mentioning only one battle and in placing the camp of the Jews west of the Nile, whereas it must have been east of the Nile. Josephus, he suggests, has erred under the influence of his knowledge of battles fought by Mithridates with Caesar in the vicinity of Lake Mareotis.

ALESSANDRÍ (1169h), commenting on the relations between Rome and Judaea (Ant. 12. 414–419), concludes that the statement of Valerius Maximus (1. 33) concerning the expulsion of the Chaldaeans and Jews in 139 B.C.E. is credible only as to the Chaldeans. As to the Jews, the *argumentum ex silentio*

drawn from Cicero's 'Pro Flacco' 28, as well as from Josephus, and especially the excellent relations then existing between Rome and Judaea indicate that the expulsion never took place.

DONAHUE (1169i), who deals with the subject of tax-collectors in Josephus and in rabbinic literature, agrees with ALLON (1169j) that the first-century Pharisees did not present a united front against the Romans and contends that we must make geographical distinctions among Galilee, Judaea, and the rest of Palestine, as well as chronological distinctions between the period before 44 and after 44. He concludes that by the New Testament period Jews took an active part in the whole taxation system.

PIATELI (1169k) uses Josephus, and especially the documents in Book 14 of the 'Antiquities', as a principal source (co-ordinating him with I Maccabees and the Talmud) for her systematic history of the political relations between Rome and Judaea from the Maccabees through Herod.

FISCHER (1169l) discusses the treaty of friendship of the high priest Judas (Ant. 12. 414) with the Romans.

I have not seen MERTENS (1169m). [See *infra*, p. 921.]

VERMES (1169n) concludes that Josephus expresses a middle-of-the-road opinion when he emphasizes that the empire permitted its Jewish subjects to live according to their national laws (Ant. 17. 314). He warns against the use of rabbinic sources in reconstructing the history of the period unless one is careful to take into account their theological speculation concerning the role of Rome in the divine world-order. ALLON (1169j), however, we may remark, has shown that the Rabbis themselves were sharply split on this question.

SMALLWOOD (1169o) presents a history of the Jews in the Roman Empire from the first century B.C.E. to the third century C.E. She stresses, relying excessively on Josephus and rejecting the majority viewpoint in the Talmud, that throughout Rome's history her treatment of the Jews shows tolerance and protection of Judaism as a religion. The book has appendices on the governors of Syria and procurators of Judaea after 70, the documents quoted by Josephus in the 'Antiquities', the north walls of Jerusalem before 70, the precise date of the fall of Jerusalem in 63 and 37 B.C.E., the censuses at the time of Jesus' birth, and chronological problems concerning Agrippa II.

APPLEBAUM (1169p) surveys the agrarian factor in Judaea from the Hasmonians to the Great Revolution against Rome, regarding this as the central factor influencing the fate of the land. He is critical of the theory of KREISSIG (1169q) that the large landowner could always undersell the small farmer thanks to the quantity of his produce. This, retorts APPLEBAUM, requires the existence of a countrywide economic structure and a single large market, which did not exist.

LEANEY and NEUSNER (1169r) offer a general survey.

SULLIVAN (1169s) pursues the same theme as his other articles on dynasties in the Near East in 'Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt', vol. 2.8, namely the loyalty of Eastern populations and their traditional aristocratic rulers, the extensive intermarriages by which the dynasties sought to strengthen themselves, and the method they used to reach accommodations with both the Romans and the Parthians during the first century C.E. SULLIVAN has special

treatments of Alexander son of Herod, Herodes Antipas, Herodes Archelaus, Herod of Chalcis, Berenice, Antipater, Aristobulus, Agrippa I, and (especially) Agrippa II. He concludes that Josephus reflects Hellenic influence among Jews in several ways, notably in his approval of the wide acquaintance with Greek culture which members of the ruling dynasty of Judaea demonstrated.

FAU (1169sa), pp. 23–117, discusses the sources of the conflict between the Jews and the Romans, and presents a history of the Jews in Palestine from the time of Pompey until the fall of Jerusalem.

GLATZER (1169sb) remarks that in Josephus' view the Romans ruled the world by the will of G-d and that desire for peace implied acceptance of the Roman yoke.

I have not seen MARSH (1169sc). [See *infra*, p. 921.]

SCARPAT (1169sd) discusses the relations of the Jews of Alexandria with Rome.

STEMBERGER (1169se) discusses the relationship of Judaism with Hellenism, Persian culture, Christianity, and Gnosticism.

THIERING (1169sf) discusses the Roman period as the historical background of the Teacher of Righteousness.

### 13.1: Anti-Semitism during the Roman Period

(1169t) EUGENE FISCHER and GERHARD KITTEL: *Das antike Weltjudentum; Tatsachen, Texte und Bilder (Forschungen zur Judenfrage, Bd. 7)*. Hamburg 1943. Pp. 1–236.

(1169u) ROBERT L. WILKEN: *Judaism in Roman and Christian Society*. In: *Journal of Religion* 47, 1967, pp. 313–330.

(1169v) WOLFGANG WIEFEL: *Die jüdische Gemeinschaft im antiken Rom und die Anfänge des römischen Christentums. Bemerkungen zu Anlass und Zweck des Römerbriefs*. In: *Judaica* 26, 1970, pp. 65–88. Trans. into English: *The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity*. In: KARL P. DONFRIED, ed., *The Romans Debate*. Minneapolis 1977. Pp. 100–119.

FISCHER and KITTEL (1169t), in a work unfortunately marred by anti-Semitism, often quote Josephus in dealing with the spread of Judaism during this period, with racial admixture and assimilation, with ancient Zionism, and with the privileges of the Jews.

WILKEN (1169u) comments on the success of the Jews in proselytism and on the developing animosity toward Jews among writers in the first five centuries of the Roman Empire.

WIEFEL (1169v), citing War 1. 157, 2. 215–217, Ant. 14. 79, 213ff., 16. 162ff., 18. 81–84, 19. 280ff., 20. 195, Apion 1. 228ff., and 2. 79ff., concludes that at the time of Nero there was a strong movement of hatred toward the Jews in Rome.



### 13.2: Josephus on Roman Institutions

(1169w) JOCHEN BLEICKEN: *Senatsgericht und Kaisergericht; eine Studie zur Entwicklung des Prozessrechtes im frühen Prinzipat* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 3. Folge, nr. 53). Göttingen 1962.

BLEICKEN (1169w), p. 94, comments on Antiquities 19. 266, 268, and 273, in his discussion of the promulgation of the decrees of the Senate and of the origin of the Imperial criminal law. As to whether βουλή means Senate or the counsel of the Emperor, he answers that either Josephus found the word *consilium* in his Latin source and translated it as βουλή without realizing that βουλή has two meanings, or he thought that the word *consilium* meant Senate. We may remark that the word *consilium* does indeed refer to the Senate, as we see, for example, in Cicero (Philippics 4.5.14): *senatum, id est orbis terrae consilium*.

### 13.3: Roman Taxation on Jews

(1169x) E. MARY SMALLWOOD: *Domitian's Attitude toward the Jews and Judaism*. In: *Classical Philology* 51, 1956, pp. 1–13.

SMALLWOOD (1169x) notes the discrepancy between Josephus (War 7. 218), who says that the *fiscus Judaicus* was imposed on the Jews everywhere, and Dio Cassius (66. 7. 2), who says that it was imposed on practicing Jews. SMALLWOOD declares that there is an inherent probability that Dio is right, since a Jew who had dissociated himself from his fellow-Jews by apostasy may well have ceased to be regarded as a Jew. Yet, says SMALLWOOD, the discrepancy is apparent rather than real, for, after referring to the Jews everywhere, Josephus says that they paid the tax to Rome just as they had previously paid the Temple tax. We may comment that from the point of view of Jewish law an apostate Jew is still fully a Jew and hence would be subject to taxation. Whether the Romans would have looked at apostate Jews thus is, of course, another matter.

### 13.4: Jews in the Roman Army

(1169y) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: *Jews and Service in the Roman Army*. In: MORDECHAI GICHON, ed., *Seventh Congress of Roman Frontier Studies*, 1967. Tel-Aviv 1971. Pp. 181–184.

APPLEBAUM (1169y) asks why Jews were rare in the Roman army whereas they were common in the armies of the Seleucids and especially of the Ptolemies. His convincing answer is that the Romans imposed an atmosphere of uniformity and that the Roman army possessed a much stronger cultic base. In addition, the rise of the Zealot movement, he suggests, made the Romans hesitant about conscripting Jews.

## 13.5: Hyrcanus II and Pompey

- (1170) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Was Hyrcanus Appointed 'Brother of the King'? (in Hebrew). In: Yedi'ot (Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society) 6, 1938–39, pp. 145–148.
- (1171) ELIAS BICKERMAN: The Maccabees: An Account of Their History from the Beginnings to the Fall of the House of the Hasmoneans. New York 1947. Rpt. in his: From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees: Foundations of Post-Biblical Judaism. New York 1962.
- (1172) EDWARD R. LEVENSON: New Tendentious Motifs in *Antiquities*: A Study of Development in Josephus' Historical Thought. Diss., M.A., Columbia University, New York 1966.
- (1173) FÉLIX-M. ABEL: Le Siècle de Jérusalem par Pompée. In: Revue Biblique 54, 1947, pp. 243–255.
- (1174) MATTHIAS GELZER: Pompeius. München 1949, 1959.
- (1175) JULES VAN OOTEGHEM: Pompée le Grand, bâtisseur d'Empire. Brussels 1954.
- (1176) MATTHIAS GELZER, rev., JULES VAN OOTEGHEM, Pompée le Grand. In: Gnomon 27, 1955, p. 196–199.
- (1176a) ERNEST RENAN: Histoire du peuple d'Israël. Vol. 5. Paris 1895. Trans. into English by J. H. ALLEN and Mrs. E. W. LATIMER. Boston 1896.
- (1177) EMIL SCHÜRER: Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. 3 vols. 3rd and 4th ed., Leipzig 1901–9.
- (1178) LEVI HERZFELD: Wann war die Eroberung Jerusalems durch Pompeius, und wann die durch Herodes? In: Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums 4, 1855, pp. 109–115.
- (1179) ROGER GOOSSENS: L'état actuel des recherches sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte et sur la Secte de la Nouvelle Alliance. In: La Nouvelle Cléo 1–2, 1949, pp. 634–671.
- (1180) PINKAS R. WEIS: The Date of the Habakkuk Scroll. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 41, 1950–51, pp. 125–154.
- (1181) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Hebrew Scrolls: A Challenge to Scholarship. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 41, 1950–51, pp. 251–275.
- (1182) DOUGLAS L. M. DREW: Pompey's Capture of Jerusalem on Tenth Tishri? In: Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts. Cairo, Fouad I University 13, 1951, pp. 83–88.
- (1183) MERTON B. DAGUT: The Habakkuk Scroll and Pompey's Capture of Jerusalem. In: Biblica 32, 1951, pp. 542–548.
- (1184) NORMAN H. SNAITH: Studies in the Psalter. London 1934.
- (1185) WOLFGANG ALY: Strabon von Amaseia. Bonn 1957.
- (1186) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte. Paris 1950.
- (1187) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: La prise de Jérusalem par Pompée d'après la légende juive de 'la ville inconquise'. In: Bonner Jahrbücher 164, 1964, pp. 53–87.
- (1188) SAMSON HELFGOTT: Observance of the Sabbath in the Graeco-Roman Period. Diss., D.H.L., Yeshiva University, New York 1974.
- (1189) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Scythopolis. In: Israel Exploration Journal 12, 1962, pp. 123–134.
- (1189a) VIKTOR BURR: Rom und Judäa im 1. Jahrhundert v. Chr. (Pompeius und die Juden). In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI, ed., Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Vol. 1.1, Berlin 1972, pp. 875–886.
- (1189b) E. MARY SMALLWOOD: The Jews under Rome Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 20). Leiden 1976.

SCHALIT (1170) notes that in War 1. 121, after the civil war between the brothers Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II, Hyrcanus, after abdicating his throne,

continued to enjoy all his other honors as the king's brother, whereas in *Antiquities* 14. 7, Hyrcanus II, defeated, retired to being a private citizen. SCHALIT comments that the title 'brother of the king' was well-known in the ancient Near East and implied participation in the government, and that Hyrcanus was presumably left with the high priesthood, a position of importance which Aristobulus would hardly have allowed his brother to keep. However, the problem with the parallels cited by SCHALIT, we may reply, is that Hyrcanus was actually the brother of the king and hence the title can hardly have any special significance. There is no necessary contradiction, we may add, between the 'War' and the 'Antiquities' since the 'Antiquities' speaks of his being a private citizen as compared to his previous political role as king.

BICKERMAN (1171) concludes that the fall of the Hasmonean dynasty was due not to intestinal strife, as Josephus would have it, but to the Romans, and that the quarrel between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus actually saved Jerusalem because it led to the Romans' appearance as allies of at least one of the parties.

LEVENSON (1172) notes that Hyrcanus is treated more favorably than Antipater in the 'Antiquities' as compared with the 'War', despite the fact that he is consistently treated less favorably than Aristobulus and concludes that this was because Josephus became more negative toward the Roman subjugators of his homeland and accordingly more nationalistically Jewish.

ABEL (1173) presents a general summary of the reasons for Pompey's intervention in Judaea and of the details of the siege. He concludes that Josephus' account reflects his role as a historian partial to Rome.

GELZER (1174), pp. 93–111, presents a straightforward, popular account, largely based on Josephus, of Pompey's campaigns in Syria and Judaea. OOTEGHEM (1175), pp. 226–238, though highly readable, presents nothing really new in his uncritical account, which does not discuss at all whether Josephus is a reliable source and which is unduly dependent upon his predecessors; as GELZER (1176) in his review comments, it is incomprehensible that OOTEGHEM, p. 236, citing RENAN (1176a), pp. 150–151, should assert that the Jews took the conquest of Jerusalem so little to heart, since in the Psalms of Solomon (and, we may add, in several places in the Talmud – Baba Kamma 82b, Sotah 49b, and Menahoth 64b) we see their bitter reaction.

SCHÜRER (1177), vol. 1, p. 298, following HERZFELD (1178), says that the day of the fast (Strabo, 16. 40; Josephus, *Ant.* 14. 487) on which Pompey captured the Temple was the Day of Atonement, that the Romans had confused it with the Sabbath, and that Josephus misunderstood the Gentile source which he was following. GOOSSENS (1179) says that Josephus, Strabo, and Dio Cassius (49. 22) are in agreement in placing the capture of the Temple on the twelfth of Tishre but that the chronology was perverted in different ways by Strabo and Dio, while that of Josephus is correct. But the Day of Atonement is on the tenth, not the twelfth of Tishre, and the account of Josephus in the 'War' (1. 146) seems to differ from that in the 'Antiquities' (14. 487), which says that he captured it on the day of the Fast.

WEIS (1180) remains skeptical that Pompey entered Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement and points to ZEITLIN's (1181) theory that it was on the ninth of

Tammuz. He says that if the actual conquest had taken place on the Day of Atonement Josephus would certainly not have failed to expound on the great significance of that day; but, we may reply, the *argumentum ex silentio* is not strong.

DREW (1182) disputes the date given by Strabo (16. 40) and Josephus (Ant. 14. 487), "the day of the Fast", and prefers that of Dio Cassius (49. 22) and Josephus' 'War' (1. 146) that the city was taken on the Sabbath. We may note, however, that Josephus (War 1. 146) does not say that Pompey captured Jerusalem on the Sabbath; he says that the Roman troops took advantage of the fact that the Jews refrained from work on the Sabbath to build earthworks; apparently they utilized many Sabbaths in this way.

DAGUT (1183) asserts that Josephus (Ant. 14. 66) has confused the Day of Atonement with the Sabbath since the rest of his narrative points to July/August as the month when Jerusalem fell; but we may comment that it seems unlikely that Josephus, who was a well-educated priest, should have committed this error.

SNAITH (1184), pp. 80–82, says that the accounts in Josephus (War 1. 146 and Ant. 14. 487) are in accordance with those in the rabbinic tractate 'Arakhin 11b–12a and Seder Olam Rabbah 30, and that Psalm 94 was the Psalm sung on the Sabbath when the Temple was captured; but it is clear that the rabbis are speaking of the destruction of the Temple by Nebuchadnezzar and Titus rather than by Pompey, who did not destroy the Temple; and the Talmud itself ('Arakhin 12a) says that the Psalm is that of the fourth day of the week.

ALY (1185), pp. 165–170, commenting on the chronology of the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, similarly asserts that the statement in the 'War' (1. 146) that Pompey captured Jerusalem on the Sabbath is correct. But the day of the Fast may refer to the Sabbath, we may comment, since a number of the ancients (Strabo, 16. 40; Augustus, ap. Suetonius, Augustus 76; Pompeius Trogus, ap. Justin 36. 2; Persius 5. 184; Petronius, fragment 37; and Martial 4. 4) confused the Sabbath with a fast day, probably the Day of Atonement, which in the Bible (Leviticus 16. 31) is called a "Sabbath of Sabbaths". The origin of this error, we here suggest, may be in the word νηστεία, "fasting", which means "abstention" in the broad sense, including abstention from work (compare its use in this sense in Against Apion 2. 282). Josephus may here be following his source, Strabo, in asserting that the capture took place on the day of the Fast, which Strabo (16. 40) significantly explains as the day when the Jews abstained (ἀπείχοντο) from all work; but Josephus may have understood it to mean not the Fast of the Day of Atonement but that of the seventeenth of Tammuz or of the ninth of Ab (July/August), on the latter of which, according to tradition, a number of calamities befell the Jews, including the fall of the Second Temple. Hence there is no need for ALY's transcriptionally improbable emendation in Antiquities 14. 487 of ἔτει for μηνί; it was indeed in the third month of the siege, or perhaps of the Jewish calendar (i.e. Tammuz), if we suppose that Josephus is referring to the breach in the walls, we may suggest, not the third year that the Temple fell. The catastrophe on the Day of Atonement mentioned by the Habakkuk Commentary does not, then, in all probability, refer to Pompey's capture of Jerusalem, as DUPONT-SOMMER (1186) and ALY (1185) think, but rather to Nebuchadnezzar's

capture of the city, since the real catastrophe is not the capture of Jerusalem but the destruction of the Temple, which took place in the time of Nebuchadnezzar and not in that of Pompey, who left the Temple intact and whose capture of the Temple is unmentioned in all rabbinic literature.

DEL MEDICO (1187) argues that the accounts of Josephus and of Josippon with regard to the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey are marked by the legend of the unconquered Jerusalem created, for the sake of non-Jews along the borders of the Roman Empire, as early as the reign of Nero.

HELFGOTT (1188) argues that Pompey captured Jerusalem on the Day of Atonement, since Josephus (Ant. 14. 66) says that it was captured on the fast day. He says that it is unlikely that Josephus would merely copy the report of Strabo, especially, we might add, of so celebrated an event and one with which he, as a priest, was so deeply concerned, without checking its accuracy.

AVI-YONAH (1189) says that Josephus contradicts himself when he lists Scythopolis as one of the deserted cities mentioned by Pompey (Ant. 14. 75), whereas previously (Ant. 13. 355) he says that Alexander Jannaeus made an alliance with Cleopatra III there, thus indicating that the town was not deserted but merely no longer enjoyed the privileges of an autonomous Greek *polis*. We may comment that there is no necessary contradiction, since there is no indication in Antiquities 14. 75 that the city was deserted; Josephus says merely that Pompey restored it to its own inhabitants. It is only Gadara which is singled out as a deserted city. Moreover, if Alexander Jannaeus received Cleopatra III there (Ant. 13. 355), this was before Jannaeus' capture and destruction of Gadara (Ant. 13. 356) (and perhaps of Scythopolis).

BURR (1189a) remarks that Josephus' distance in time from the events of 63 B.C.E., when Pompey captured the Temple, made possible an objective judgment. We may, however, note that no Jew, let alone a priest, could be objective with regard to the Temple; and, in the case of Josephus, his close connection with the Romans was surely the major factor that dictated his attitude. BURR says that neither Josephus, in his vague statement that the Temple was captured on a fast day, nor Strabo (16. 2. 40) nor Dio (37. 1b) permits the fixing of an exact day for the capture.

SMALLWOOD (1189b), pp. 565–567, says that it appears very improbable that Jerusalem would have fallen on the Day of Atonement, since it seems hardly likely that Hyrcanus' Jewish supporters would have taken part in an assault during the holiest day of the year. SMALLWOOD explains how Josephus came to the conclusion that it was the Day of Atonement by suggesting that Josephus took it from Strabo, without realizing that by a fast day Strabo (16. 2. 40. 763) meant the Sabbath. We may comment that Strabo says that Pompey captured Jerusalem on the day of abstention (*νηστεία*), and that this term, which here probably refers to abstention from work, came to be looked upon by the pagans mistakenly as abstention from food.

### 13.6: The Partition of Judaea by Gabinius

- (1190) BARUCH KANAEL: The Partition of Judea by Gabinius (in Hebrew). In: Yediot: Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society 18, 1954, pp. 168–175. Trans. into English: Israel Exploration Journal 7, 1957, pp. 98–106.
- (1191) ERNST BAMMEL: The Organization of Palestine by Gabinius. In: Journal of Jewish Studies 12, 1961, pp. 159–162.
- (1192) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 7, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV (Loeb Classical Library). London 1943.
- (1193) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: Gabinius' Organization of Palestine. In: Journal of Jewish Studies 18, 1967, pp. 89–92.
- (1194) ARNOLD H. M. JONES: The Herods of Judaea. Oxford 1938.
- (1195) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Roman Administration in Palestine (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1937.
- (1196) ERNST BAMMEL: Die Neuordnung des Pompeius und das römisch-jüdische Bündnis. In: Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 75, 1959, pp. 76–82.
- (1196a) MENAHEM STERN: The Description of Palestine by Pliny the Elder and the Administrative Division of Judea at the End of the Period of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: Tarbiz 37, 1967–68, pp. 215–229.
- (1196b) WOLFGANG ROTH: Galilee before Jesus. In: Explor 3, 1977, pp. 18–35.

The identification of the five regions into which Gabinius divided Judaea (Ant. 14. 91) has exercised a number of scholars. KANAEL (1190) disagrees with the general view that Gabinius followed the principle of “divide and rule”, says that he hoped to consolidate the situation in Judaea during the emergency caused by his impending campaign against the Parthians, that he in fact followed the country's natural regions in his partition, and that this apportionment was followed again under Herod and in the revolutionary organization of 66. As for the identification of the fifth district, he suggests that its capital Gadara (Gadara) is a scribal error for Adora and that the fifth district was Idumaea; but this, we may comment, conflicts with the evidence that Adora was independent at this time.

BAMMEL (1191) identifies the capital of the fifth district not as Gadara of the Decapolis, which had been detached by Pompey and joined with Syria, but as Gazara in northwest Judaea. But, as MARCUS (1192), ad loc., comments, Gadara would not become Gazara in Aramaic. He concludes that the partition probably took place in the year 55 and that Antipater, who was in charge of Jerusalem, had only financial powers, inasmuch as the political power lay in the hands of the Sanhedrin (Ant. 14. 103; cf. Ant. 14. 127, 139).

SMALLWOOD (1193), following JONES (1194), p. 24, and SCHALIT (1195), p. 31, identifies the Gadara of the fifth district as the metropolis of Peraea rather than the Gadara of the Decapolis. This would admittedly mean that the district administered from Amathus would have been small. But, we may comment, to establish this thesis, JONES, SCHALIT, and SMALLWOOD must assert that Josephus erred in stating (Ant. 13. 356, 374) that Alexander Jannaeus conquered Gadara and Amathus in Lower Syria, hence in the Decapolis. To say, as SMALLWOOD does, that this makes little military sense since Pella, which lay between Gadara and Amathus, remained independent, is to disregard the fact that such pockets of territory were not infrequently found in the midst of kingdoms.

BAMMEL (1196) contends that the treaty with Rome in 161 B.C.E. which made Judaea an equal partner with Rome was not abrogated by Pompey's capture of Jerusalem in 63 B.C.E. but merely was not observed in view of the exceptional provocation (as Pompey had done in Syria), that the Roman Senate never ratified Gabinius' partition, and that when Julius Caesar conquered the East, he merely returned to the enforcement of the treaty of 161.

STERN (1196a), commenting on the toparchical division of Judaea in Josephus (War 3. 54–58), suggests that the division as given by Pliny (Nat. Hist. 5. 14. 70) goes back to a source contemporary with Herod and reflects the situation during his reign, though in some details he takes into account the changes that had occurred in his own time. The division into toparchies in the 'War' reflects the age of the patriarchs, when the Idumaean toparchies had already been incorporated into Judaea proper.

ROTH (1196b), commenting on the organization of Galilee as a separate community within the province of Syria by Gabinius, when he assisted Pompey in the establishment of the province in 63 B.C.E., remarks that this is an example of the Roman imperial maxim "divide and rule".

### 13.7: The Documents in 'Antiquities', Book 14

- (1197) EMIL SCHÜRER: Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. 3 vols. 3rd and 4th ed., Leipzig 1901–9.
- (1198) MATTHIAS GELZER: Cäsar, der Politiker und Staatsmann. Stuttgart 1921; 6th ed., 1960. Trans. into English by PETER NEEDHAM: Caesar: Politician and Statesman. Oxford 1968.
- (1199) THOMAS RICE E. HOLMES: The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire. Vol. 3. Oxford 1923; New York 1967.
- (1199a) R. FRUIN: Studien in de joodsche geschiedenis na 333. III. Het Senaatsbesluit bij Josephus Antt. XIV c. 145. In: Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift 26, 1937, pp. 37–51.
- (1200) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: Storia d'Israele, 4th ed., Torino 1947. Trans. into French by PAUL AUVRAY: Histoire d'Israël. 2 vols. Paris 1939. Trans. into English by CLEMENT DELLA PENTA and RICHARD T. A. MURPHY: The History of Israel. 2 vols. Milwaukee 1955. Trans. into German by KONSTANZ FASCHIAN: Geschichte Israels. 2 vols. Wien 1953–55. Trans. into Polish: Dzieje Izraela. Warsaw 1956. Trans. into Spanish: Historia de Israel. Barcelona 1945.
- (1201) DAVID L. MAGIE: Roman Rule in Asia Minor to the End of the Third Century after Christ. 2 vols. Princeton 1950.
- (1202) SIMEON L. GUTERMAN: Religious Toleration and Persecution in Ancient Rome. London 1951.
- (1203) JAAKKO SUOLAHTI: The Council of L. Cornelius P. f. Crus in the Year 49 B.C. In: Arcos 2, 1958 (= Mélanges Johannes Sundwall), pp. 152–163.
- (1204) THOMAS FISCHER: Untersuchungen zum Partherkrieg Antiochos' VII. im Rahmen der Seleukidengeschichte. Diss., München 1970. Published: Tübingen 1970.
- (1206) HORST R. MOEHRING: The *Acta Pro Judaeis* in the *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus: A Study in Hellenistic and Modern Apologetic Historiography. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part 3: Judaism before 70 (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 12, part 3). Leiden 1975. Pp. 124–158.

- (1206a) THOMAS ROBERT S. BROUGHTON: *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. New York 1951–52; supplement 1960.
- (1206b) LEOPOLD WENGER: *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*. Wien 1953.
- (1206c) ELIAS J. BICKERMAN: *The Altars of Gentiles. A Note on the Jewish 'ius sacrum'*. In: *Revue Internationale des Droits et de l'Antiquité*, Ser. 3. 5, 1958, pp. 137–164.
- (1206d) ROBERT K. SHERK: *Roman Documents from the Greek East. Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*. Baltimore 1969.
- (1206e) ADALBERTO GIOVANNINI and HELMUT MÜLLER: *Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und den Juden im 2. Jh. v. Chr.* In: *Museum Helveticum* 28, 1971, pp. 156–171.
- (1206f) MENAHEM STERN: *Die Urkunden*. In: JOHANN MAIER and JOSEF SCHREINER, edd., *Literatur und Religion des Frühjudentums*. Würzburg 1973. Pp. 181–199.
- (1206g) THOMAS FISCHER: *Zu den Beziehungen zwischen Rom und den Juden im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86, 1974, pp. 90–93.
- (1206h) DIETER TIMPE: *Der römische Vertrag mit den Juden von 161 v. Chr.* In: *Chiron* 4, 1974, pp. 133–152.
- (1206i) E. MARY SMALLWOOD: *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden 1976.
- (1206j) ZVI YAVETZ: *Caesar and Caesarism: Essays in Roman History (in Hebrew)*. Tel-Aviv 1971.

Josephus quotes a number of decrees in 'Antiquities', Book 14, the authenticity and dating of which have been much disputed. Their authenticity is generally accepted, as SCHÜRER (1197) has noted, and since lively contacts existed among Jewish communities, Josephus would have had no difficulty obtaining official documents from their archives; or, alternatively, the documents may have been assembled in Josephus' major source, Nicolaus of Damascus, or by Josephus' close friend, Agrippa II, son of Agrippa I, who may have had access to them because of his close association with the Emperors Caligula and Claudius. But the fact that there are no documents about the rights of the Jews of Alexandria, whereas there are many for the Jews of Asia Minor, a much less important if no less populous community, would indicate that Josephus' source was more interested in Asia Minor than in Egypt.

GELZER (1198), pp. 238–239 (German version) and 258–259 (English version), concludes that the decrees in *Antiquities* 14. 196–198, 207–210, are supplementary decrees, presumably of 46 B.C.E. The decree quoted in 14. 200–201 concerning construction of the walls of Jerusalem is to be dated in 44 B.C.E., though according to 14. 144 and 14. 156 permission for this had already been given in 47 B.C.E.

HOLMES (1199) resolves the discrepancies in the dating of the decrees by assuming that Caesar granted permission in one year and had this confirmed by the Senate in another year.

FRUIN (1199a), in discussing the dating of the treaty of the friendship of the Romans with the Maccabees (*Ant.* 14. 145–148), notes that the high priest was appointed on Passover.

RICCIOTTI (1200), commenting on this treaty, which speaks of an embassy to Rome which Josephus dates in the time of Julius Caesar and Hyrcanus II, concludes that this date cannot be correct since it would mean that the same Numenius had been sent three times to Rome within a few years and that on



two of these occasions he had been accompanied by Antipater son of Jason and had brought a golden shield and negotiated with Lucius. But, we may comment, this may indicate that Numenius was a successful envoy and had been asked to serve again and again or that he was sent back to complete the original negotiations.

MAGIE (1201), in his already classic work, notes (e.g., vol. 2, p. 1256, n. 76, on Ant. 14. 230, 235, etc.) errors in Josephus' terminology of the titles of Roman rulers in Asia Minor, correcting Josephus on the basis of inscriptions. In general, without definitely committing himself, he tends (p. 1046, n. 34) to be suspicious of the authenticity of the documents cited by Josephus in Book 14, especially the decrees of Pergamum (Ant. 14. 247–248).

GUTERMAN (1202), pp. 108–113, stresses that the decrees of Book 14, which he accepts as genuine, envisage the organization of the Jews both in the East and in the West as based on associations or *collegia*.

SUOLAHTI (1203) examines the names of the members of the council convoked by Cornelius Lentulus (Ant. 14. 229 and 238–239) which exempted the Jews of Ephesus from military service and concludes that its make-up was traditional.

FISCHER (1204) deals with the documents in Antiquities 13. 259–260, 14. 144–148, and 14. 247–255 and concludes that all are genuine, though reworked.

MOEHRING (1206) argues that the acceptance or non-acceptance of the authenticity of the documents cited by Josephus in 'Antiquities' 14 and 16 has depended not so much on intrinsic factors as on the apologetic concerns of modern historians themselves. He imputes significance, however, to Josephus' silence about the fire of 69 in which three thousand documents in the Roman archives were destroyed, cites instances where decrees of the senate were forged, asserts that in antiquity historians probably did not bother to check the original texts of decrees and were content with second-hand opinions about them, and notes a number of instances where the texts of the document are unusually corrupt and where Josephus' versions of decrees do not correspond to the standard known to us from epigraphical evidence. He concludes that the invitation to check the accuracy of his statements by consulting the original documents is merely a literary device. He correctly notes how much information was necessary in order to find a given decree in the archives; and we may add that this deterred not only Josephus and his assistants but also anyone who sought to check up on them. We may also note that even if someone were to take all the trouble to check up on Josephus and were to discover a discrepancy, Josephus could always have claimed that the original copy, which was destroyed in the fire of 69 and a copy of which he had seen in the archives of the city with which the decree dealt, was worded in accordance with the quotation in his work rather than as found in Vespasian's copy.

BROUGHTON (1206a), *passim*, cites Josephus, especially in connection with the decrees which he quotes in Book 14.

WENGER (1206b), pp. 68–70, comments on the documents in Josephus.

BICKERMAN (1206c) says that the decrees of Sardis (Ant. 14. 260) granting a piece of land to Jewish residents in which they offer their ancestral prayers and

sacrifices reproduces the request of the Jews and cannot be a mistake of the city secretary. The Jews, he remarks, needed a place for sacrifices to be offered to G-d by the G-d-fearing pagans, that is, the 'sympathizers' with Judaism.

SHERK (1206d) presents decrees of the Roman Senate which are in the form of inscriptions. It is hard, we may remark, to understand why he restricts himself to these and does not include those cited by Josephus and other literary sources. In any case, however, the inscriptional matter is of great value for comparison with the relevant documents in Josephus.

GIOVANNINI and MÜLLER (1206e), commenting on I Maccabees and Antiquities 12. 417, 14. 190ff., etc., deal with the chronology of the decrees of the senate pertaining to the relations of Rome with the Jews. These decrees, they say, resulted from the treaty contracted between Rome and Judaea.

STERN (1206f), pp. 192–199, presents a brief survey of the documents – Ant. 14. 145ff., 16. 166ff., and 19. 286–289.

FISCHER (1206g) regards the documents of the second century B.C.E. in Josephus and in I Maccabees as authentic. The gradual attainment of independence by Judaea from Seleucid supremacy, he concludes, is very closely bound up with the simultaneous transition to client status with Rome.

TIMPE (1206h) states that the Fannius who sent a letter to the people of Cos (Ant. 14. 233) cannot be the Fannius the praetor who convinced the Senate to renew the treaty of friendship with Judaea because of the chronological discrepancy.

SMALLWOOD (1206i), pp. 558–560, concludes that the authenticity of the documents quoted by Josephus in Antiquities 14. 190–264 and 16. 162–173 is hardly in doubt. It is possible, she says, that Josephus took the documents from Nicolaus of Damascus, in which case the latter was responsible for at least some of the misattributions; but this, she remarks, does not exonerate Josephus from his evident failure to comprehend what he was copying. We may, however, remark that more likely Josephus had access to the documents while he was in Rome under the auspices of the Flavians.

YAVETZ (1206j), pp. 52–55, comments on Julius Caesar's decrees pertaining to the Jews.

### 13.8: Antigonus

(1206l) JEHOShUA M. GRINTZ: The Long Way Home of the Last of the Hasmoneans (an Historical Commentary on the Inscription from Giv'at Ha-mivtar) (in Hebrew). In: Ha-Ummah 13, 1974–75, pp. 256–269.

GRINTZ (1206l), commenting on a newly discovered Aramaic inscription of a certain Abba, "the oppressed and persecuted", who went into exile to Babylonia and brought back to Jerusalem Mattathiah son of Judah, whom he buried there, dates this event in 40 B.C.E. on the basis of Josephus. GRINTZ identifies this Mattathiah with Antigonus, the last of the Hasmonean kings.

## 13.9: Antipater

- (1207) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Die frühchristliche Überlieferung über die Herkunft der Familie des Herodes. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Invektive in Judäa. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 1, 1962, pp. 109–160.
- (1208) AKIVA GILBOA: The Grant of Roman Citizenship to Antipater, Herod's Father (in Hebrew). In: *Mehkarim be-Toldoth 'Am-Yisrael ve-Erez-Yisrael* (Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel) 1, 1970, pp. 71–77.
- (1209) AKIVA GILBOA: L'octroi de la citoyenneté romaine et de l'immunité à Antipater, père d'Hérode. In: *Revue Historique de Droit Français et Étranger*, no. 4, 1972, pp. 609–614.
- (1209a) MOSES ABERBACH: The Historical Allusions of Chapters IV, XI, and XIII of the Psalms of Solomon. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 41, 1950–51, pp. 379–396.
- (1209b) JACK LINDSAY: *Cleopatra*. New York 1971.

SCHALIT (1207) asserts that the accounts of Justin and of Sextus Julius Africanus of the Idumaeen origin of Antipater and Herod depend ultimately on a Jewish tradition which was preserved by the Christians only because of their hatred for Herod's murder of the children of Bethlehem. In contrast to Jannaeus, who had barbarian blood in him, the Antipatrids, according to the Herodians, came from a Babylonian-Jewish family and hence were, they felt, the only ones worthy to rule Israel.

GILBOA (1208)(1209) suggests that the scope of the immunity (ἀτέλεια) granted to Antipater, in addition to Roman citizenship, by Julius Caesar in 47 B.C.E. was not different from the exemption from taxation (ἀνεισφορία) bestowed, together with Roman citizenship, on Seleucus of Rhosus by Octavian at about the same time (41–36 B.C.E.).

ABERBACH (1209a) notes that chapter 4 of the Psalms of Solomon contains a virulent denunciation of an unnamed person which, he says, fits Antipater, father of Herod, who feigned external piety to gain the support of the Pharisees. He discounts the possibility of identifying him with Alexander Jannaeus or Aristobulus II. We may, however, comment that the reference is much too general to be decisive.

LINDSAY (1209b), pp. 52–53, concludes that Josephus (War 1. 187–192 and Ant. 14. 128–136) mentions only one battle fought by Mithridates because he is interested in showing only that Antipater played a crucial part in the campaign. He displaces it to the west bank of the Nile by a partial conflation with the second battle. Dio (42. 41–43) similarly mentions only one battle because he is writing concisely.

## 14: Herod

### 14.0: Herod: General Treatments

- (1210) BROOKE F. WESTCOTT: Herod. In: WILLIAM SMITH and JOHN M. FULLER, edd., *A Dictionary of the Bible*. Vol. 1, part 2. London 1893. Pp. 1340–1346.
- (1211) FREDERIC W. FARRAR: *The Herods*. New York 1898.
- (1212) WALTER OTTO: Herodes I – Herodias. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplement 2, 1913, cols. 1–205.
- (1213) HUGO WILLRICH: *Das Haus des Herodes zwischen Jerusalem und Rom*. Heidelberg 1929.
- (1214) ARNALDO D. MOMIGLIANO: Josephus as a Source for the History of Judaea. In: STANLEY A. COOK et al., *Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 10. Cambridge 1934. Pp. 884–887.
- (1215) ARNOLD H. M. JONES: *The Herods of Judaea*. Oxford 1938.
- (1216) JOSEF KLAUSNER: La vida política y económica de Judea durante el reinado de Herodes. In: *Judaica* (Buenos Aires) 26, no. 154, 1946, pp. 154–162 (translated from Hebrew by Dora Henquin).
- (1217) GEORGE W. EDWARDS: The Maladjustment of Palestinian Economy under Herod. In: *American Academy of Religion, Journal of Bible and Religion* 17, 1949, pp. 116–119.
- (1218) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: Erode I. In: PIO PASCHINI et al., edd., *Enciclopedia Cattolica* 5, Città del Vaticano 1950, pp. 512–514.
- (1219) WERNER FÖRSTER: *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*. Vol. I: *Das Judentum Palästinas zur Zeit Jesu und der Apostel*. 3rd ed., Hamburg 1959. Trans. into English by GORDON E. HARRIS: *Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times*. Edinburgh 1964.
- (1220) ABEL J. HERZBERG: *Herodes: De Geschiedenis van een Tyran*. Amsterdam 1955.
- (1221) STEWART PEROWNE: *The Life and Times of Herod the Great*. London 1956. Trans. into German by HARTMUT SCHMÖKEL: *Herodes der Grosse*. Stuttgart 1957. Trans. into French by NATHALIE GARA: *Hérode le Grand et son époque*. Paris 1958.
- (1222) MARTIN BRAUN: King Herod as Oriental Monarch: Ancient History and the Modern British Mind. In: *Commentary* 25, 1958, pp. 48–53.
- (1223) HORST R. MOEHRING: *Novelistic Elements in the Writings of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., University of Chicago 1957.
- (1224) ROKUICHI SUGITA: *Yadaya ō Herode (= Herod the Judaeen King)* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1957.
- (1225) BEN-ZION LURIE: The Last War of the Hasmonean House (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron* 39, 1958–59, pp. 28–34.
- (1226) BEN-ZION LURIE: Figures from the Time of Sossius' Conquest of Jerusalem (in Hebrew). In: *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* 1, Jerusalem 1967, pp. 95–98 (English summary, p. 259).
- (1227) WERNER FÖRSTER: Herodes und sein Nachfolger. In: KURT GALLING, ed., *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*<sup>3</sup>. Vol. 3. Tübingen 1959. Pp. 266–269.
- (1228) JOSEF BLINZLER: Herodes. In: JOSEF HÖFER and KARL RAHNER, edd., *Lexikon für*

Theologie und Kirche, founded by M. BUCHBERGER. 2nd ed., Freiburg 1957–65. Vol. 5. Freiburg 1960. Pp. 263–267.

- (1229) BO REICKE: Herodes der Grosse: Seine Karriere und seine Bedeutung für das Judentum. In: *Reformatio* 9, 1960, pp. 24–34.
- (1230) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: King Herod, the Man and His Work (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1960. Trans. into German by JEHOCHUA AMIR: König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk (*Studia Judaica*, 4). Berlin 1968.
- (1231) LEONHARD ROST: Erwägungen zum Kyroserlass Verbannung und Heimkehr. In: ARNULF KUSCHKE, ed., *Beiträge . . . Wilhelm Rudolph zum 70. Geburtstag* dargebr. Tübingen 1961. Pp. 301–307.
- (1232) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Studies in Josephus*. London 1961.
- (1233) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: Herod the Great: Judaea's Most Able but Most Hated King. In: *History Today* 12, 1962, pp. 234–242. Rpt. in his: *Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men, and Events*. New York 1969. Pp. 209–222.
- (1234) WILLIAM J. GROSS: *Herod the Great*. Baltimore 1962.
- (1235) ISTVÁN HAHN: Herodes provinciális szolgálatá (= Herod's Administration of His Province) (in Hungarian). In: *Antik tanulmányok* 9, 1962, pp. 219–227. German résumé in: *Bibliotheca Classica Orientalis* 10, 1965, p. 239.
- (1236) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Herod (Family). In: *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 2, Nashville 1962, pp. 585–594.
- (1237) JEAN BECQ: Hérode, le politique, le constructeur. In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 60, Dec. 1963, pp. 2–5.
- (1238) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Herod a Malevolent Maniac. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 54, 1963–64, pp. 1–27. Rpt. in: SOLOMON ZEITLIN, *Solomon Zeitlin's Studies in the Early History of Judaism*. New York 1973. Pp. 312–338.
- (1239) J. GONZÁLES ECHEGARAY: Herodes I; Herodes Agripa [sic] I/II; Herodes Antipas. In: *Enciclopedia de la Biblia* 3, Barcelona 1964, pp. 1192–1198; 1198–1204; 1204–1206.
- (1240) BO REICKE: Herodes. In: BO REICKE and LEONHARD ROST, edd., *Biblisch-historisches Handwörterbuch* 2, Göttingen 1964, pp. 696–703.
- (1241) AL. A. BOTEZ: Viața și moartea lui Irodimpărat (= Life and Death of King Herod) (in Rumanian). In: *Biserica Ortodoxă Română* 83, 1965, pp. 1147–1155.
- (1242) GEÖRGIOS GRATSEAS: Hērōdēs. In: *Thrēskēutikē kai Ēthikē Egkuklopaideia* 6, 1965, pp. 69–71.
- (1243) ALEKSANDER KRAWCZUK: *Herod, król Judei*. Warszawa 1965.
- (1244) MENAHEM STERN: The Politics of Herod and Jewish Society towards the End of the Second Commonwealth (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 35, 1965–66, pp. 235–253.
- (1245) MOSES ABERBACH: Josephus – Patriot or Traitor? In: *Jewish Heritage* 10, Fall 1967, pp. 13–19.
- (1246) CARSTEN COLPE: Herodes, 1. In: *Der Kleine Pauly* 2, Stuttgart 1967, cols. 1090–1092.
- (1247) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Herod: Profile of a Tyrant. Philadelphia 1967. Trans. into German by ULRICH BRACHER: *Herodes: Bildnis eines Tyrannen*. Stuttgart 1968.
- (1248) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Giessen 1920.
- (1249) JAMES P. M. WALSH: Herod the Great. In: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 6, 1967, pp. 1080–1082.
- (1250) HUGH ANDERSON: The Intertestamental Period. In: William Barclay et al., *The Bible and History*. London and Nashville 1968. Pp. 153–244.
- (1251) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *Historical Geography of Palestine from the End of the Babylonian Exile to the Arab Conquest* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1949; 2nd ed., 1951; 3rd ed., 1962. Trans. into English: *The Holy Land from the Persian to the Arab Conquests (536 B.C. to A.D. 640): A Historical Geography*. Grand Rapids 1966 (trans. of 3rd Hebrew edition with numerous revisions). Another trans. by CHARLES WEISS and PAMELA FITTON: *A History of the Holy Land*. London 1969.

- (1252) THOMAS CORBISHLEY: The History of Israel, II: 130 B.C.—A.D. 135. In: REGINALD C. FULLER, ed., *A New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*. London 1969. Pp. 86–92.
- (1253) JOHN GRAY: *A History of Jerusalem*. New York 1969.
- (1254) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: JOHN GRAY, *A History of Jerusalem*. In: *Classical Journal* 69, 1973–74, pp. 85–88.
- (1255) CHARLES H. MILLER: Herod and His Family. In: *Bible Today* 45, 1969, pp. 3106–3113.
- (1256) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: A Clash of Ideologies: Palestine under the Seleucids and Romans. In: ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE, *The Crucible of Christianity: Judaism, Hellenism, and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith*. London 1969. Pp. 47–76.
- (1257) BEN-ZION LURIE: King Herod (in Hebrew). In: SAMUEL ABRAMSKY et al., edd., *Sepher Shemuel Yevin*. Jerusalem 1970. Pp. 501–538.
- (1258) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: Herod I. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 375–385.
- (1259) ANONYMOUS: Herod in the Arts. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 385–386.
- (1260) BATHJA BAYER: Herod in Music. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 386–387.
- (1261) MENAHEM STERN: History. Erez Israel – Second Temple. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 625–642.
- (1262) GERHARD FRIEDRICH: Herodes, König der Juden. In: *Zeitwende* 42, 1971, pp. 383–394.
- (1263) MICHAEL GRANT: *Herod the Great*. London 1971.
- (1264) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Herodes und seine Nachfolger. In: *Kontexte* 3, 1966, pp. 34–42. Trans. into English by BRIAN WATCHORN: Herod and His Successors. In: HANS J. SCHULZ, ed., *Jesus in His Time* (trans. of: *Die Zeit Jesu*. Stuttgart 1966). Philadelphia 1971. Pp. 36–46.
- (1265) MENAHEM STERN: The Reign of Herod and the Herodian Dynasty. In: SHMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, edd., in co-operation with DAVID FLUSSER and WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK, *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (MARINUS DE JONGE and SHMUEL SAFRAI, edd., *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, vol. 1). Assen 1974. Pp. 216–307.
- (1265a) BUNZO AIZAWA: An Inquiry concerning King Herod (in Japanese). In: *Hirosakidaigaku jinmon shakai*, no. 9, March 1956, pp. 33–64.
- (1265b) BUNZO AIZAWA: King Herod's Policy on Rule (in Japanese). In: *Hirosakidaigaku jinmon shakai*, no. 15, March 1958, pp. 1–26.
- (1265c) HAJIME INOUE: Herod the Great (in Japanese). In: *Sekai dai hyakka jiten* (World Encyclopedia), vol. 26, Tokyo, July 1958, p. 158.
- (1265d) MENAHEM STERN: The Politics of Herod and Jewish Society towards the End of the Second Commonwealth (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 35, 1965–66, pp. 235–253.
- (1265e) E. COLEIRO: Quis Tiphys? In: *Latinitas* 22, 1974, pp. 109–116.
- (1265f) BEN-ZION LURIE: From Jannaeus to Herod: Studies in the History of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1974.
- (1265g) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: Judaea as a Roman Province; the Countryside as a Political and Economic Factor. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI und WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 2.8, 1977, pp. 355–396.
- (1265h) GERHARD PRAUSE: Herodes des Große. König der Juden. Hamburg 1977.
- (1265i) EPHRAIM URBACH: Jewish Doctrines and Practices in the Hellenistic and Talmudic Periods. In: SALO W. BARON and GEORGE S. WISE, edd., *Violence and Defense in the Jewish Experience*. Philadelphia 1977. Pp. 71–85.

Among the numerous older treatments of Herod, we may mention WESTCOTT (1210), who seeks for a balanced picture of Herod as a popular hero, comparing him with Henry VIII; FARRAR (1211), who presents, with an anti-rabbinic bias, a popular retelling of Josephus' narrative; OTTO (1212), easily the most complete and most important study before SCHALIT's, sincerely attempting to view Herod without prejudice and with all the tools available to the modern historian; and WILLRICH (1213), a work marred by anti-Semitism, which attempts to prove that Herod was an enlightened ruler who unsuccessfully tried to improve the conditions of the Jews but failed because of their perverse stubbornness.

MOMIGLIANO (1214) notes a number of contradictions between the accounts of Herod in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities'. He concludes that neither for the 'War' nor for the 'Antiquities' need we assume an anonymous intermediary between Josephus and his sources.

JONES (1215), writing in a rather popular style, relies, as he must, chiefly on Josephus, though he carefully notes that the main problem of the modern historian of this period is to sift the sources from which Josephus derived his information, to assess their value, and to consider the extent to which Josephus has colored his account. On the whole, he is sympathetic to Josephus' pro-Roman, anti-Zealot bias; his defense of Herod, whom he praises for establishing law and order, is remarkably strong but ultimately unconvincing.

KLAUSNER (1216) presents a survey which betrays his strong bias in favor of the Hasmonean dynasty and his consequent strong prejudice against Herod as a usurper who despised the Jews and clearly deserved their hatred.

EDWARDS (1217), who takes Josephus at face value, concludes that the Romans were moderate in their demands on the Palestinian economy, but that the tax burden imposed by the Jews on themselves was far greater. Moreover, as EDWARDS points out, a large part of the money raised by Herod was spent outside of Palestine.

RICCIOTTI (1218) presents a brief, sound survey.

FÖRSTER (1219) presents a generally sympathetic portrait of Herod, who is said to have shown great concern for the welfare of his people; but the bitterness in the Talmud toward him, we may comment, would hardly seem to bear out this picture.

HERZBERG (1220), in addition to his play about Herod, presents a popular account of his life.

PEROWNE (1221), writing popularly, follows Josephus closely. His book is delightfully well written, though clearly biased in favor of Herod.

In a scathing review of PEROWNE's book, BRAUN (1222) contends, with some justice, that PEROWNE, who lived for many years as a British civil servant in mandated Palestine, betrays pro-Arab sympathies in portraying Herod as an Arab who struggled all his life against the foolish nationalism of the Jews. PEROWNE's affection for Herod as the champion of the Roman Empire and of Western civilization is clearly out of line with the Talmudic repugnance for him, we may note. PEROWNE poignantly summarizes Herod's career as the story of

an upstart who conquered a kingdom, won a princess, and lived unhappily ever after.

MOEHRING (1223) analyzes, *inter alia*, the novelistic-erotic element in Josephus' account of the life of Herod, the relations between Herod and Mariamne, and the death of Herod. He hardly proves, however, that these erotic elements are Josephus' invention, since we do not have Josephus' sources, notably Nicolaus of Damascus, with which to check him.

I have been unable to obtain SUGITA (1224), one of several indications of a recent upsurge of interest in Jewish history of this period in Japan; but, in a private communication, GOHEI HATA writes that SUGITA is an amateur whose work is based on an uncritical use of Josephus' works in English translation.

LURIE (1225) notes that Antigonus' war against Herod was not the last of the wars of the Hasmonians for the freedom of Judah but that his sister continued to hold the fortress of Hyrcania (War 1. 364). LURIE (1226) identifies this sister with the maiden who, according to the Talmud (Baba Bathra 3b), threw herself from a roof, whose body Herod preserved in honey for seven years, and with whom, according to some, he had intercourse. But, we may respond, this maiden in the Talmud is almost certainly Mariamne, whom Herod married and who was not a sister of Antigonus. In any case, it is usually Josephus' way to give cross-references when he mentions someone whom he has spoken of previously; and he has no such reference when he introduces Mariamne.

FÖRSTER (1227) and BLINZLER (1228) have brief but fair surveys.

REICKE (1229) has a general survey in which he concludes that Herod was great, at least as a statesman.

SCHALIT (1230) has written a work of monumental significance which, like his great predecessor OTTO, attempts to approach Herod without prejudice. He gives special attention to the political and cultural ideas which influenced Herod in his reign. Herod, he says, wished to be the champion of a spiritual metamorphosis of the Jewish people. SCHALIT stresses that Herod had an almost religious faith in Rome's mission to rule and in Augustus' mission to save the world. It is this soteric aspect of Augustus as unifier of the Roman Empire that was Herod's model; and Herod included himself as a partner in the work of this salvation. SCHALIT's appraisal of the extent of independence which Augustus permitted Herod is particularly good. Only through loyalty to the Emperor could lasting peace and prosperity come to the Jews, Herod argued. SCHALIT convincingly establishes that economically the Jews were far better off at the end of Herod's reign than at the beginning, and that, in particular, his building program alleviated the problem of unemployment. But, we may object, a study of his finances indicates that the average Jew had a very low income indeed. Again, the fact that Samaria was in such a terrible state economically in the second century despite the fact that it had not suffered unduly in the revolts against Rome shows that Herod's policy was far less than successful economically. In view of the tremendous obstacles placed in the path of Herod, his achievements are all the greater. As to the murders of his wife and sons, Herod, says SCHALIT, did not murder simply for the sake of killing but to protect his



kingdom, and, in any case, he should be judged by the standards of the time: one thinks, most notably, of Mithradates the Great of Pontus, who, earlier in the first century B.C.E., had murdered his mother, his sons, and his sister (who was also his wife), as well as his concubines. He was, if not insane, certainly not fully responsible for his actions, says SCHALIT. We may comment that Herod does seem to have been a paranoiac who killed for the sake of killing; perhaps his reason had been deranged much earlier by the terrible disease from which he eventually died.

It is SCHALIT's view that it was primarily the Jews' faith in G-d and in the coming of the Messiah in contrast to Herod's faith in Rome that was the obstacle to Herod; but if so, we may ask, why was Josephus, who shared Herod's view, so critical of Herod, especially in the 'Antiquities'? SCHALIT concludes that Herod accomplished so much for his people that he fully merits the title 'King of Israel'.

The German version of SCHALIT contains much supplementary material, as well as seven short additional notes and appendices.

ROST (1231) discusses the privileges obtained by Herod for the Jews of Asia Minor (Ant. 16. 162ff.) and cites parallels with the edict of Cyrus.

SHUTT (1232), to explain the discrepancies between the 'War' and the 'Antiquities' in their accounts of Herod, assumes that after the death of his friend and patron Agrippa II, Josephus inserted the criticisms of Herod in the second edition of the 'Antiquities'. But the theory of a second edition, we may remark, rests upon flimsy conjecture; and, in any case, Agrippa II was hardly likely to be favorably disposed toward the memory of Herod, who had put to death both his grandfather Aristobulus and the latter's mother Mariamne, so that Josephus need hardly have been deterred from writing critically about Herod during Agrippa's lifetime.

BRANDON (1233), in a popular essay, presents another exaggerated attempt to rehabilitate Herod. He notes that Herod won and held the respect of a series of Roman statesmen and concludes that, despite the hatred of the Jews, he made them prosperous. Herod was shrewd and experienced and showed vision in his policy of appeasing Hellenism in the Diaspora in order to improve the relations of Diaspora Jews with their Gentile neighbors without affronting the Jews of Judaea too directly.

GROSS (1234) presents a popular and romanticized biography based mainly on Josephus.

HAHN (1235) argues that Herod, simultaneously with his kingship, also exercised the position of στρατηγός in the province of Syria.

SANDMEL (1236) presents a clear summary, with a critical view of Josephus; but he is much more critical of the Gospels as a source.

BECQ (1237) presents a popular general survey of the political background of Herod and of his building program.

ZEITLIN (1238) concludes that Josephus used material both favorable and unfavorable to Herod but did not blend his sources well. He denies SCHALIT's view that Herod believed himself to be the Messiah since, he says, at the time of Herod the Jews did not believe in a Messiah; but, we may comment, the tradi-

tion of a Messiah is clearly present in the prophets, notably in Zechariah, as well as in the 'Sibylline Oracles' and the Book of Enoch, both dating from the mid-second century B.C.E. He concludes that Herod was a paranoiac, but that the Jews of the Diaspora whom he identifies as the Herodians, admired him since, through his friendship with Caesar, they received many benefits. As to the question whether Herod was a Jew, ZEITLIN notes that there is no evidence whether his mother was or was not a convert; but in the Talmud, we may note, the charge that Herod was not a Jew is ever-present; and ZEITLIN's argument that the Jewish delegation to Augustus after Herod's death could have used this as its trump card if he was indeed not a Jew is not valid since such an argument would hardly be likely to impress Augustus, who would have regarded this as an indication of narrow-mindedness. Moreover, we may add, the identification of the Herodians with the Diaspora Jews is hardly consonant with the fact that the New Testament (Mark 3. 6, 12. 13, Matt. 22. 16) mentions them as joining the Pharisees in Palestine against Jesus. Perhaps they are to be identified with the partisans of Herod mentioned in Josephus (Ant. 14. 479) who again are in Judaea. It seems that they were a political group who, after the death of Herod, whom they apparently regarded as the Messiah, sought the re-establishment of the rule of Herod's descendants over an independent Palestine as a prerequisite for Jewish preservation. Unlike the Zealots, however, they did not refuse to pay taxes to the Romans.

I have been unable to see ECHEGARAY (1239).

REICKE (1240) presents a very brief factual survey of Herod and his family.

BOTEZ (1241) has a general survey.

GRATSEA (1242) has a very cursory treatment of Herod the Great, Herod Antipas, Herod Agrippa I, Herod Agrippa II, and Herod Philippus.

I have not seen KRAWCZUK (1243), a popular survey.

STERN (1244) notes that Herod gave important positions, especially the high priesthood, to families of Egyptian and Babylonian origin in his effort to free himself of association with the Hasmonean dynasty. Josephus' account is here supported by the Talmud. This policy, which met with the approval of Jews in Idumaea and Galilee, marked a turning point in Jewish social history, since these new elements continued to exert influence on Judaism until the year 70.

ABERBACH (1245) says that Josephus sometimes praises and sometimes denounces Herod, depending on the sources which he copied. He criticizes him for not making the slightest attempt to reconcile contradictory statements or even to explain that they represent different views. But, we may comment, while Josephus is, to be sure, full of inconsistencies and tendentiousness, part of this is due to the fact that Herod himself was full of contradictions, and Josephus realized this in his account.

COLPE (1246) has a brief but balanced factual survey of Herod's life.

SANDMEL'S (1247) popular work stresses the deleterious influence which his power had upon Herod and the madness to which it led him; the fear of the loss of power, he well concludes, was the mightiest corrupter of all. He comments in particular on the difficulty of using Josephus as a source, not only because the two accounts of Herod (War 1. 204–673 and Antiquities 14. 158–17. 192) are

full of contradictions, but because Josephus is guilty, in accordance with standard Hellenistic practice, of accenting the tragic so as to increase the pathos. He rightly, however, criticizes as exaggerated the theory of LAQUEUR (1248) that the account of the 'Antiquities' is permeated with an animosity toward Herod not discernible in the 'War'. SANDMEL fails to note, however, that Herod may have strengthened the Pharisees because, according to the Sadducean view, he was not a real Jew, whereas the Pharisees acknowledged the complete Jewishness of converts and descendants of converts. All in all, SANDMEL counteracts the excessive nationalism in SCHALIT's portrait.

WALSH (1249) merely summarizes, in uncritical fashion, Josephus' account.

ANDERSON (1250) concludes that Herod was one of the most competent rulers of his day, but that in the last decade of his life he was *non compos mentis*. In particular, he credits him with using his influence with the Roman rulers to champion the rights of Jews of the Diaspora and to establish the religious liberty of the Jews at home.

AVI-YONAH (1251) says that there can be no doubt that Herod counted himself a Jew and observed the Torah with greater fidelity than he has been given credit for. He notes that at Masada the excavations of YADIN have failed to reveal the slightest trace of images of any living creature. That this was, however, we may note, a mere expedient in order not to offend Jewish sensibilities rather than a mark of sincerity may be seen from his gross violations of Jewish law with regard to images abroad.

CORBISHLEY (1252) is critical of Josephus' statement that the relations between Augustus and Herod were intimate; but, we may remark, in view of Julius Caesar's great appreciation for the help given him by Herod's father Antipater and in view of Herod's undoubted bravery and gifts as an administrator, such an intimacy is not to be ruled out.

GRAY's (1253) popular account, as I (1254) have noted in my review, continues the tendency found in so many books on Herod, notably SCHALIT, to defend Herod. As to the Roman decision to declare Herod king, he calls this (p. 154) a turn of fortune beyond anticipation. But, we may reply, the decision actually made sense: the coffers of Rome were empty from almost a hundred years of civil war; and, according to Josephus' version of the incident in the 'Antiquities', Herod offered Antony a large bribe. GRAY goes so far as to say that the fact that Herod's relations with the Jews of the land of Israel were not cordial was due to no fault of his. Yet, we must object, it was surely a provocation for Herod to introduce athletic contests and to build a theatre in Jerusalem. The fact, moreover, that he introduced contests between wild beasts and criminals was utterly abhorrent to the Jews. Finally, his execution of Pharisees such as Judah ben Zippori and Mattathias ben Margalit was surely an act for which he deserved to bear the most serious consequences.

MILLER (1255) presents a popular, uncritical summary.

SCHALIT (1256) presents a popular summary of his book on Herod, stressing that Herod conceived of himself as the Messiah and castigating the Pharisees for not supporting Herod's view that it was necessary to adopt a realistic attitude toward the Roman Empire. But, we may reply, to judge from the

Talmud, the Pharisees were, on the whole, positively inclined toward Rome and did not favor a revolution.

LURIE (1257) objects to SCHALIT's attempt to show that Herod deserved the title 'the Great'. But, we may comment, he goes too far in the other direction when he asserts that during all the days of his rule he did nothing for the good of his people, since economically, at least, there is some evidence that he relieved unemployment and, to some degree, built up the Judaeian standard of living and since he did much to restore privileges to the Jews outside the land of Israel, notably in Asia Minor.

APPLEBAUM (1258) has a balanced picture, though he notes that Herod, in practice, did away with the authority of the rabbinic Sages. This article is followed by two interesting surveys, Herod in the Arts (1259) and BAYER's (1260) Herod in Music, the former of particular value.

STERN (1261) presents a very favorable picture of Herod, noting his many achievements and omitting mention of his madness.

FRIEDRICH (1262) has an unoriginal, popular survey.

GRANT (1263) has a very readable account. He correctly notes that while the 'Antiquities' is usually more critical of Herod than is the 'War', sometimes the reverse is the case; thus Antiquities 14. 163–167 is actually more favorable to the Idumaeian house than is War 1. 208–209. GRANT suggests that this is due to additional research on the part of Josephus. He credits Herod with foreseeing the catastrophe that would envelop the Jews if they ceased to play the Romans' game and concludes that he thus deserved the title 'the Great'.

SCHALIT (1264), in a lecture originally delivered on the radio, has a short popular survey of the reigns of Herod and of his successors.

STERN (1265), in a well-documented survey, plausibly suggests that Josephus found some corrective for Nicolaus of Damascus' version in the circle of Agrippa I, Herod of Chalcis, and Agrippa II, who were descended from Herod but were not favorably disposed toward him. He admits, however, that, though Nicolaus is not mentioned as a source in the 'War', Josephus did rely greatly on him in that work since he found Nicolaus' tendency in harmony with his own. He suggests that Josephus' criticism of Herod is his own rather than from an anti-Herodian source; but we may reply that in view of Josephus' descent from the Hasmoneans, Herod's bitter opponents, he might well have had family traditions critical of Herod.

I have not seen AIZAWA (1265a)(1265b) or INOUE (1265c).

STERN (1265d) notes that under Herod the supporters of the Hasmoneans lost their positions. His program was strongly supported not only by various elements in Palestine and Idumaea but also, to a lesser degree, in Galilee. Jews of Egyptian and Babylonian origin rose to high estate. Indeed, STERN believes the reign of Herod to be a turning point in the social history of Palestine; and the changes which he originated turned out to be lasting until the destruction of the Second Temple, perhaps, we may add, because the Romans favored Herod and his successors. Examples of persons who rose under Herod are Costobar (War 1. 486, Ant. 15. 252–260) and Alexas (War 1. 660, Ant. 17. 175), whose children, indeed, continued to fill important posts. We may comment, however,

that the notion of Herod's popularity is based primarily on Josephus' chief source, Nicolaus of Damascus, who, as Herod's secretary, was certainly partial to him.

COLEIRO (1265e) identifies Tiphys, the helmsman of the *Argo* (Virgil, *Eclogues* 4. 34), with Herod, and states that the child of the eclogue is the infant whom Herod was awaiting. The suggestion seems far-fetched, since Virgil could hardly have looked upon a non-Roman as a source of national salvation.

LURIE (1265f), in a clear reaction against SCHALIT's (1230) position, concludes that it is an error for historians to bestow upon Herod the title 'the Great'.

APPLEBAUM (1265g) says that Herod's work of colonization of Palestine was important, since he thus developed the land into a productive agricultural region. Josephus, however, has underestimated the burden of taxation under Herod; if the Roman tribute is added, then the situation was indeed intolerable.

PRAUSE (1265h) has a popular account, largely indebted to SCHALIT (1230) and SANDMEL (1247), rehabilitating Herod, with particular attention to his relationship to the Roman imperial class, his building program, and economic and political skills. He tries to correct Josephus and explains how it has come about that Herod has been painted in such dark colors.

URBACH (1265i) declares that Josephus exaggerates in his negative description of Herod in order to justify his praise of Agrippa I.

#### 14.1: Herod: the Numismatic Evidence

- (1266) BARUCH KANAEL: The Coins of King Herod of the Third Year. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 42, 1951–52, pp. 261–264.
- (1267) URIEL RAPAPORT: Note sur la chronologie des monnaies hérodiennes. In: *Revue Numismatique* 10, 1968, pp. 64–75.
- (1268) JOSEPH MEYSHAN (MESTSCHANSKI): Chronology of the Coins of the Herodian Dynasty (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 6, 1940, pp. 104–114.

KANAEL (1266) comments on the significance of the symbols on Herod's bronze coins. In particular, he asserts that the symbol TP on these coins stands for τριτῷ ἔτει, "in the third year", i.e. the third year of his reign (37 B.C.E.), when Herod defeated Antigonus and became king in fact, as is explicitly stated in War 1. 343 and Antiquities 14. 465.

RAPAPORT (1267) takes issue with KANAEL and asserts, on the basis of Antiquities 17. 191, that the capture of Jerusalem took place not in the third but the fourth year of Herod's reign. But, we may comment, Herod had been named king in the autumn of 40 (Ant. 14. 389) and defeated Antigonus in the spring of 37 (two and one half years later); and Antiquities 17. 191 indicates that he put Antigonus to death three years after being named king; hence KANAEL's position seems to be borne out.

MEYSHAN (1268) has a very thorough, systematic survey of the chronology as derived from the coins of Herod, Herod Archelaus, Herod Antipas, Philip the Tetrarch, Agrippa I, Herod of Chalcis and his son Aristobulus, and Agrippa

II. He neatly correlates changes in style, quality, inscriptions, and symbols on coins with historical events, noting that coins always record conditions *de jure* and not *de facto*.

### 14.2: Herod's Appearance

- (1269) HARALD INGHOLT: A Colossal Head from Memphis, Severan or Augustan? In: *Journal of American Research Center Egypt* 2, 1963, pp. 125–142.

INGHOLT (1269) describes a bust of a bearded man with Semitic features found in Egypt at Memphis and now in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston and suggests that it may be Herod. Inasmuch as Josephus, despite his extremely detailed treatment of Herod, does not give any description of Herod's appearance, we are left with mere conjecture. That Herod should have allowed a bust of himself to be made outside the land of Israel is certainly possible in view of his leniency in observing the law regarding images outside Israel. But INGHOLT has not sufficiently explored the question of date, and indeed the bust might be anything from Ptolemaic (third century B.C.E.) to Severan (third century C.E.). He suggests that the statue was made for the Memphite Idumaeans to whom Herod very likely gave money for a temple; but, we may remark, Josephus says nothing about Herod's gift of a temple to the Idumaeans of Memphis. We may, however, suggest that if the Herodians are the followers of Herod in the Diaspora who persisted after his death they may have erected the statue on their own.

### 14.3: Herod's Title 'the Great'

- (1270) HEINRICH EWALD: *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Vol. 4 (3rd ed.). Göttingen 1864.  
 (1271) HARALD INGHOLT: Some Sculptures from the Tomb of Malkû at Palmyra. In: MARIE-LOUISE BERNHARD et al., *Mélanges Kazimierz Michalowski*. Warsaw 1966. Pp. 457–476.  
 (1272) HAROLD W. HOEHNER: *Herod Antipas*. Cambridge 1972.

EWALD (1270), p. 546, noting that the title ὁ μέγας is found only in Antiquities 18. 130, 133, and 136, and not on inscriptions or on coins, plausibly suggests that its meaning is not 'the Great' but rather 'the Elder' in comparison with his sons.

INGHOLT (1271) notes that the epithet *rab* in Aramaic inscriptions from Palmyra dating from the first three centuries C.E. signifies not 'the Great' but 'the Elder' and suggests that the similar epithet ὁ μέγας used of Herod has the same significance.

HOEHNER (1272) remarks that the title ὁ μέγας is used of Agrippa I in Josephus (Ant. 17. 28; 18. 110, 142; 20. 104), as well as on coins, and hence signifies 'the Great', whereas its non-appearance on coins of Herod indicates that it means 'the Elder'. But, we may reply, its appearance or non-appearance on coins is of less importance than the fact that the epithet ὁ μέγας is so commonly

used as a special title of monarchs, starting with Ardiaeus the Great in Plato's 'Republic' (615C) and extending through Alexander (Athenaeus 1.3d) and Antiochus (Polybius 4.2.7), etc. The average reader would consequently have understood the epithet in the sense of 'the Great'.

#### 14.4: The Chronology of Herod's Reign

- (1273) JACK FINEGAN: *Handbook of Biblical Chronology: Principles of Time Reckoning in the Ancient World and Problems of Chronology in the Bible*. Princeton 1964.
- (1274) W. E. FILMER: *The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great*. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 17, 1966, pp. 283–298.
- (1275) TIMOTHY D. BARNES: *The Date of Herod's Death*. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 19, 1968, pp. 204–209.
- (1275a) E. MARY SMALLWOOD: *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian* (*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, 20). Leiden 1976.

FINEGAN (1273) discusses the chronology of Herod in Josephus (pp. 230–234) and the question of how long it took Herod to build the Temple (pp. 276–279); and, on the basis of Josephus, he concludes that Jesus was born no later than the spring of 4 B.C.E.

FILMER (1274), drawing upon Josephus and Dio Cassius, rejects the usual date of 4 B.C.E. and regards it as probable that Herod died in January of the year 1 B.C.E. (the date of a total lunar eclipse) and consequently places Jesus' birth later. But, we may reply, FILMER's reconstruction produces difficulties in the chronology of Herod's successors, and he is forced to resort to co-regencies.

BARNES (1275) convincingly reverts to the traditional date of Herod's death (March/April 4 B.C.E., possibly December, 5 B.C.E.) on the basis of the facts that Archelaus was deposed in 6 C.E. (Dio 55.27.6) in the tenth year of his reign (Ant. 17.342; War 2.111 has the ninth year) and that a lunar eclipse occurred on March 13, 4 B.C.E.

SMALLWOOD (1275a), pp. 565–567, declares that the tradition that Herod took possession of his kingdom in 37 B.C.E. by a desecration of the Jews' most sacred day (Ant. 14.487) may be a slander to discredit him in Jewish eyes.

#### 14.5: Herod's Trial before the Sanhedrin

- (1276) HUGO MANTEL: *Herod's Trial* (in Hebrew). In: *Bar-Ilan: Annual of Bar-Ilan University* 1, Jerusalem 1963, pp. 165–171.
- (1277) AARON KIRSCHENBAUM: *Studies in Agency for a Sinful Deed: II* (in Hebrew). In: *Yearbook of Jewish Law* (Tel-Aviv University) 1, 1974, pp. 219–230.
- (1277a) D. R. CATCHPOLE: *The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial*. In: *Festschrift C. F. D. Moule*. London 1970. Pp. 47–65.

MANTEL (1276), in his attempt to reconcile the contradictions among War 1.208ff. and Antiquities 14.163ff., recounting how the Sanhedrin summoned Herod to trial for having killed without a trial Ezekiel, a bandit leader, together

with many of his followers, and the Talmud's account (Sanhedrin 19a) of the trial of Herod before the Sanhedrin, suggests that the trial took place in two stages. But, we may comment, this requires identifying Herod with the Talmud's slave of Alexander Jannaeus and Samaias with the Talmud's Simeon ben Shetaḥ. The identification with the slave of Jannaeus is not unlikely in view of the fact that the Talmud is extremely contemptuous of Herod's origins; but inasmuch as Josephus elsewhere (Ant. 15. 370) mentions Samaias as a disciple of Pollion (apparently Abtalion), the identification with Simeon ben Shetaḥ is chronologically unlikely. Moreover, we may ask, if the Talmud really intended us to understand a reference to Herod, why should it not have mentioned his name?

KIRSCHENBAUM (1277) asks whether there may be an echo of the trial in the Talmud (Kiddushin 43a): "If one says to his agent 'Go forth and slay a soul', the latter is liable, and his sender is exempt. Shammai the Elder said on the authority of Haggai the Prophet: 'His sender is liable'". KIRSCHENBAUM, after a thorough review of the scholarship on this subject, plausibly concludes that there is no connection. In Josephus Samaias accuses Herod of killing men without a trial, and there is no question of agency, whereas in the Talmud it is agency that is at issue.

CATCHPOLE (1277a), p. 59, comments on the proceedings against Herod (Ant. 14. 163–184).

#### 14.6: Herod's Legal Position vis-à-vis Augustus and the Roman Empire

- (1278) HERMANN BENGTON: Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht I–III (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, vol. 32). Vol. 2, part 2: Die Strategie in den Nachfolgestaaten des Seleukidenreiches. München 1944.
- (1279) WALTER OTTO: Herodes I. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplement 2, 1913, cols. 1–205.
- (1280) ETHELBERG STAUFFER: Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. Bern 1957.
- (1281) BØRGE SALOMONSEN: Einige kritische Bemerkungen zu Stauffer's Darstellung der spätjüdischen Ketzergesetzgebung. In: *Studia Theologica* (Aarhus) 18, 1964, pp. 91–118.
- (1282) GLEN W. BOWERSOCK: *Augustus and the Greek World*. Oxford 1965.
- (1283) ISTVAN HAHN: Herodes als Prokurator. In: *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt 2: Römisches Reich*. Berlin 1965. Pp. 25–44.
- (1284) ERNST BAMMEL: Die Rechtsstellung des Herodes. In: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 84, 1968, pp. 73–79.

BENGTON (1278), pp. 265–270, accepts the view that Josephus is right in declaring (War 1. 213, Ant. 14. 180) that Herod was appointed στρατηγός (provincial prefect) of Coele Syria and Samaria, the proof being Herod's invasion of Samaria (War 1. 229, Ant. 14. 284). In general, BENGTON follows OTTO (1279) closely throughout.

STAUFFER (1280) asserts that Herod had complete power to apply a death penalty. SALOMONSEN (1281) argues, however, that Herod may have exercised



such powers but did not possess them in the juristic sense. Josephus, he contends, does not show us whether in questions of civil law Herod had the *jus gladii*.

BOWERSOCK (1282), pp. 54–57, concludes that both Augustus and Herod understood the nature of the client kingship, the disintegration of which BOWERSOCK proceeds to describe briefly.

HAHN (1283) notes that Herod is three times mentioned by Josephus as Roman στρατηγός of Coele Syria, namely for the years 47/46, 43/42, and 30 B.C.E., and thus concludes that Herod was simultaneously king of Judaea and a Roman provincial administrator. HAHN also comments on the apparent contradiction between War 1.399, which says that Augustus appointed Herod ἐπίτροπος (“procurator”) of all Syria, and Antiquities 15.360, which states that Augustus ἐγκαταμίγνυσι (“associated”) Herod with the procurators (τοῖς ἐπιτροπεύουσιν) of Syria. He reconciles these passages by noting that Augustus stated in the latter passage that Herod’s consent was to be obtained by the others in all their actions and by indicating that ἐπίτροπος is not here used by Josephus in its technical sense. If so, we may comment, this is not the only place where Josephus is less than precise in his terminology with regard to Roman administration (cf., e.g., the loose use of terminology with regard to Pontius Pilate’s position). It may be, we would suggest, that Herod was ἐπίτροπος of all Syria but στρατηγός only of Coele Syria and Samaria.

In an effort to determine Herod’s legal position, BAMEL (1284) focusses on two cases of Augustus’ intervention into Herod’s jurisdiction, the question of the succession to Herod’s throne and Augustus’ threat in 8 B.C.E. to withdraw his friendship from Herod and to treat him as a subject (Ant. 16.290). To judge from the proceedings in the dispute between Herod and his sons, Herod as a client-prince was subject to the emperor directly and not to the Senate. The fact that Herod in his fourth will made Augustus his heir shows that his right to name his successor had not been reduced.

#### 14.7: Herod and Babylonian Jewry

(1284a) JACOB NEUSNER: The Jews East of the Euphrates and the Roman Empire. I. 1st–3rd Centuries A.D. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.9.1, 1976, pp. 46–69.

NEUSNER (1284a), pp. 50–52, theorizes that Herod aspired to a greater realm than Palestine and therefore tried to win the loyalty of the Jews in Babylonia, as well as of the Greeks in Antioch, Rhodes, and southern Syria. Hence Herod’s appointment of a high priest from Babylonia. We may suggest that such an aim would almost certainly have aroused the enmity of the Romans, whose client Herod was, and that more likely his motive was merely to gain support against the Hasmoneans, whom he and his father Antipater had displaced and who were still popular in Palestine.

### 14.8: Herod as Administrator

(1284b) ISTVÁN HAHN: Herod's Administration of His Province (in Hungarian). In: *Antik tanulmányok – Studia Antiqua* 9, 1962, pp. 219–227.

I have not seen HAHN (1284b).

### 14.9: Herod's Military Colony of Batanaea

(1285) ARNOLD H. M. JONES: *The Herods of Judaea*. Oxford 1938.

(1286) JACOB NEUSNER: *A History of the Jews in Babylonia*. Vol. 1: *The Parthian Period*. Leiden 1965; 2nd ed., 1969.

(1287) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: *The Troopers of Zamaris* (in Hebrew). In: AKIBA GILBOA et al., *Mehkarim be-Toledoth 'Am-Yisroel ve-Erez-Yisrael* (Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel) 1, Haifa 1970. Pp. 79–88.

(1288) GETZEL M. COHEN: *The Hellenistic Military Colony: A Herodian Example*. In: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 103, 1972, pp. 83–95.

JONES (1285), p. 78, conjectures that Herod used Idumaeans and Babylonian Jews as settlers of Batanaea east of the Sea of Galilee because he did not fully trust native Jews.

NEUSNER (1286) rightly denies that the deportation of Zamaris from Babylonia (Ant. 17. 23–31), who then became the head of Herod's military colony at Batanaea, is evidence of Parthian anti-Semitism. He notes this incident as an example of Herod's policy of favoring Babylonian Jews.

APPLEBAUM (1287) notes that Zamaris' emigration from Babylonia in 23 B.C.E. is to be understood in the light of the fact that the Parthian empire was loosely organized and encouraged the rise of quasi-independent subordinate states, such as this, as well as that of Anilaeus and Asinaeus (Ant. 18. 310–379). Such military settlements were quite common in the Hellenistic Age.

COHEN (1288) cites Josephus' description (Ant. 17. 23–31) of the colony of Babylonian Jews set up by Herod in Batanaea as an example of a Hellenistic military colony. In contrast to JONES (1285), COHEN plausibly suggests that Babylonian Jews were favored for their military prowess, in particular because of their reputation as archers. While the type of settlement in Batanaea is unparalleled among Seleucid colonies, it does exhibit strong similarities, as noted by COHEN, to a Ptolemaic military colony in Ammonitis about 260 B.C.E. By giving the land outright and tax-free, Herod enabled Zamaris, the leader of the colony, to defend himself and to plunder the Arabs freely. Thus, without assuming responsibility for Zamaris' actions, Herod secured his northeastern frontier.

### 14.10: The Place of Sports in Herod's Politics (see also 20.9)

(1288a) MANFRED LÄMMER: *Eine Propaganda-Aktion des Königs Herodes in Olympia*. In: *Kölner Beiträge zur Sportwissenschaft* 1, 1972, pp. 160–173.

- (1288b) MANFRED LÄMMER: Die Kaiserspiele von Caesarea im Dienste der Politik des Königs Herodes. In: *Kölner Beiträge zur Sportwissenschaft* 3, 1974, pp. 95–164.

I have not seen the two articles by LÄMMER (1288a)(1288b) dealing with Herod's endowment of the Olympic Games (War 1. 426–427, Ant. 16. 149) and with his institution of the games at Caesarea (War 1. 415, Ant. 15. 341, 16. 136–141). [See *infra*, p. 924.]

#### 14.11: Herod's Building Program

- (1289) ANDREAS EVARISTUS MADER: Ein Bilderzyklus in der Gräberhöhle der St. Euthymios-Laura auf Mardes (Chirbet el-Mard) in der Wüste Juda. In: *Oriens Christianus* 34, 1937, pp. 27–58, 192–212.
- (1290) JOHN W. CROWFOOT, KATHLEEN M. KENYON, ELEAZAR L. SUKENIK: The Buildings at Samaria. Vol. 1. London 1942.
- (1291) ANDREAS EVARISTUS MADER: Mambre. Die Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen im heiligen Bezirk Râmet el-Ḥalîl in Südpalästina 1926–1928. Vol. 1. Freiburg in Breisgau 1957.
- (1292) GÜNTHER HARDER: Herodes-Burgen und Herodes-Städte im Jordangraben. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 78, 1962, pp. 49–63.
- (1293) ILANA D'ANCONA PORTE: The Art and Architecture of Palestine under Herod the Great: A Survey of Major Sites. Diss., Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1966 (abstract in: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 71, 1966, pp. 341–344).
- (1294) MORDECAI GIḤON: Edom-Idumea and the Herodian Limes (in Hebrew). In: SHALOM PERLMAN and B. SHIMRON, edd., *Doron: Dedicated to the Sixtieth Anniversary of Ben Zion Katz*. Tel-Aviv 1967. Pp. 205–218. Trans. into English in: *Israel Exploration Journal* 17, 1967, pp. 27–42.
- (1295) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Project of King Herod in the Temple and on the Temple Mount (in Hebrew). In: GEDALYAH ELKOSHI et al., edd., *And to Jerusalem: Literature and Meditation in Honor of the Liberation of Jerusalem* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1968. Pp. 318–324.
- (1296) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: La Jérusalem du temps d'Hérode. *Bible et Terre Sainte* 117, 1970, pp. 6–13.
- (1297) R. GRAFMAN: Herod's Foot and Robinson's Arch. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 20, 1970, pp. 60–66.
- (1297a) KATHLEEN KENYON: Some Aspects of the Impact of Rome on Palestine. In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1970, pp. 181–191.
- (1297b) NAHMAN AVIGAD: Un quartier résidentiel à Jérusalem au temps d'Hérode. In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 182, 1976, pp. 7–13.
- (1297c) BENJAMIN MAZAR: Herodian Jerusalem in the Light of the Excavations South and South-west of the Temple Mount. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 28, 1978, pp. 230–237.

MADER (1289) merely summarizes the topography of Hyrcania and the archaeological finds there in the light of Josephus' description.

CROWFOOT-KENYON-SUKENIK (1290), pp. 32–34, 39–41, 55–56, 123–127, comment on buildings constructed by Herod in Samaria which were excavated in 1931–35.

MADER (1291), pp. 67–81, 209–219, comments on Josephus' description of Hebron in War 4. 530–533. He concludes that Josephus was prejudiced against Herod and hence omitted the fact that Herod was responsible for the

building of the Temenoi in Hebron and Mambre. The fact that Josephus uses the word *μυθεύουσι* ("they relate", War 4. 531) in introducing the tradition connecting Abraham and Hebron is to MADER evidence that his source for the whole passage was Marcus Antonius Julianus, the Roman writer; but the word, we may comment, does not necessarily imply his belief and may mean merely "speak" or "explain", being only an epic expression. To MADER Josephus' remarks (Ant. 1. 237) on the tombs of the patriarchs are without historical worth since they are merely a paraphrase of the Bible.

Commenting on Kypros (the new Jericho), Phasaelis, and Livias in the light of the archaeological finds, HARDER (1292) discusses the contradictions between War 1. 407 and 1. 417 and 2. 484 as against Antiquities 16. 143–145, and explains that in the last passage Josephus is thinking of Kypros before it was fortified.

ANCONA PORTE (1293) surveys the major sites — Samaria, Jerusalem, Jericho, Masada, Herodium, and Caesarea — where Herod constructed buildings, and stresses the degree of Hellenization of the Jews, particularly the upper classes, as reflected in the architecture of the period. There is no indication as to whether or not the archaeological finds confirm Josephus.

GIḤON (1294) notes that archaeological surveys confirm the existence of a system of Herodian frontier fortifications on the border of the Negev and verify Josephus' picture of the population of Idumaea as a rural frontier militia. Since the Idumaeans were a separate military administrative unit (War 2. 566) Herod was thus able to block the southern approaches to his kingdom.

AVI-YONAH (1295) presents a popular survey of the archaeological finds, which, he concludes, confirm Josephus.

AVI-YONAH (1296) presents a popular sketch, referring particularly to Herod's buildings in Jerusalem and to Josephus' description thereof.

GRAFMAN (1297), comparing Antiquities 15. 410–415 to the extant remains from the Temple, calculates the exact length of a *πούς* as .31 meter (the standard Greek foot of the period) rather than the Roman foot of .296 meter.

KENYON (1297a), commenting on Herod's buildings in Jerusalem, Caesarea, Samaria, Jericho, and Masada, ascribes the origins of Romanization to Herod and declares that he had a deliberate aim of creating cities in the classical style, as Josephus abundantly records.

I have not seen AVIGAD (1297b). [See *infra*, p. 924.]

MAZAR (1297c) notes the similarity between the archaeological discoveries and the literary description of Jerusalem in Josephus, who has been confirmed in his mention of four gates in the Western Wall, from the southernmost of which many steps descended to the Tyropoeon Valley. He notes that an inscription has been found where one of the priests was accustomed to blow a trumpet on the eve of the Sabbath (War 4. 582). The archaeological remains confirm that there had been extensive additions and changes from the days of Herod until the very eve of the destruction of the Temple in 70.

### 14.12: Herod, the Temple, and the High Priesthood

- (1298) HERMANN BENGTON: Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit. Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht I–III. Vol. 2 (= Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte. Heft 32). München 1944.
- (1299) WALTER OTTO: Herodes I. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplement 2, 1913, cols. 1–205.
- (1300) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: Antiochia in Jerusalem (On the Problem of the Legal Status of Jerusalem under the Government of the Hellenizers) (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 20 (Jacob N. Epstein Jubilee Vol.), 1950, pp. 61–67.
- (1301) JACK FINEGAN: *Handbook of Biblical Chronology*. Princeton 1964.
- (1302) JOHN GRAY: *A History of Jerusalem*. New York 1969.
- (1302a) ERNST BAMMEL: Sadduzäer und Sadokiden. In: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 55, 1979, pp. 107–115.

BENGTON (1298) agrees with OTTO (1299) that Herod insisted on naming the captain of the Temple so as to be sure to have influence over the inner workings of the Temple.

TCHERIKOVER (1300) notes that during the construction of the Temple Herod strictly observed the law prohibiting the entry of non-priests into the innermost part of the Temple. He properly distinguishes between Herod's Hellenizing tendency, which was chiefly political and designed to show his loyalty to Rome before the external world while he avoided enforcing this Hellenization upon the Jews of Palestine, and that of the high priests Jason and Menelaus during the Maccabean period, who sought to impose Hellenization upon the Jews.

FINEGAN (1301) concludes that Herod began to rebuild the Temple in the eleventh year of his reign, despite Josephus' explicit statement in *Antiquities* 15. 380 that he began it in the eighteenth year of his reign and his statement in *War* 1. 401 that he began it in the fifteenth year of his reign. This discrepancy, we may comment, may be explained by recalling that Herod was crowned king in Rome in 40 B.C.E. but that he did not attain power *de facto* until 37 B.C.E. with his victory of Antigonus. FINEGAN also comments on the meaning of *ναός* ("temple") in *Antiquities* 15. 420–421.

GRAY (1302) gives as the reason why Herod named Aristobulus, the brother of Mariamne, as high priest that he yielded to pressure from Mariamne and her mother. But, we may suggest, Josephus (*Ant.* 15. 31) gives an additional and very probable motive, namely that Herod thought it to his own advantage that Aristobulus, once placed in office, would not, in fact, be able to leave the country.

BAMMEL (1302a) notes that Boethus, Herod's appointee as high priest, introduced certain cult practices and that other priestly families came from Egypt after him. He suggests that they were from Leontopolis in view of the new cult practices. We may reply that it is unlikely that Josephus, himself a priest, would not have noted this, especially in view of his opposition to Herod. Moreover, it seems hard to believe that Herod, normally an astute politician, would have risked antagonizing, needlessly and without provocation, the priests of his kingdom by introducing priests from the heretical temple at Leontopolis.

### 14.13: Herod's Trial against His Sons

(1302b) WOLFGANG KUNKEL: Das Konsilium im Hausgericht. In: Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte (Romanistische Abteilung) 83, 1966, pp. 219–251.

KUNKEL (1302b), pp. 225–229, commenting on Herod's trial against his sons (Ant. 16. 356ff.), says that Josephus' report can, in general, be viewed as an indication of Roman law, since it depended upon orders of Augustus and took place in the veteran colony of Berytus, and since by the time he wrote about this process Josephus had been living in Rome for decades and doubtless had had many opportunities to study criminal proceedings.

### 14.14: Herod and Mariamne

(1303) JOHANNES (IOANNES) T. KAKRIDIS (KAKRIDES): Ποικίλα Ἑλληνικά (in modern Greek). In: Hellenica 13, 1954, pp. 165–174.

(1304) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Herod and Mariamne: Josephus' Description in the Light of Greek Historiography (in Hebrew). In: Molad 14, 1956, pp. 95–102.

(1305) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: King Herod: the Man and His Work (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1960. Trans. into German by JEHOSEHUA AMIR: König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk (Studia Judaica, 4). Berlin 1968.

(1306) F. LOUIS DELTOMBE: Mariamne, femme d'Hérode. In: Bible et Terre Sainte 60, 1963, pp. 21–23.

(1307) JOHN GRAY: A History of Jerusalem. New York 1969.

KAKRIDIS (1303) comments on the relationship between Herod and Mariamne, as seen in particular in War 1. 435, as an illustration of the opposition between the views of man and woman.

SCHALIT (1304), in a popular article, concludes that the psychological portrayal of Mariamne in Josephus is in the tradition of Greek tragedy and the motifs of Hellenistic historiography rather than in accordance with actual historical fact.

SCHALIT (1305) rejects the view that Herod attached importance to a marriage connection with the Hasmonians for the sake of justifying his legal position as king. According to Hellenistic concepts, he contends, the victor in war had no need of juridical support from the previous regime. Moreover, Herod gained nothing so far as winning the affection of the Jews by his marriage, since the Hasmonians were not held in favor by the populace. We may reply, however, that Herod, to judge from Josephus' and the Talmud's references to him, was keenly aware of the fact that according to Jewish law he was of questionable stock, since there is no evidence as to whether his mother was properly converted, and thus was not qualified for the kingship, which is open only to born Jews according to the Bible (Deuteronomy 17. 15), and he hoped to rectify this by his marriage to a true Hasmonian.

DELTOMBE (1306) has a brief popular survey, based primarily on Antiquities 15. 23–246.

GRAY (1307) oversimplifies in asserting that Herod married Mariamne in order to legitimize his claim to the throne; but, we must add, there is a good

deal of evidence in Josephus that Herod's marriage was, at least to a great degree, a love-affair.

#### 14.15: Herod and Cleopatra

- (1307a) OLIVER C. DE C. ELLIS: *Cleopatra in the Tide of Time*. London 1947.
- (1307b) ALEKSANDER KRAWCZUK: *Kleopatra*. Wrocław 1969.
- (1307c) JACK LINDSAY: *Cleopatra*. New York 1971.
- (1307d) MICHAEL GRANT: *Cleopatra*. London 1972.
- (1307e) AUGUSTE BAILLY: *Cléopâtre*. Paris 1939.
- (1307f) HANS VOLKMANN: *Kleopatra: Politik und Propaganda*. München 1953. Trans. into English by T. J. CADOUX: *Cleopatra: A Study in Politics and Propaganda*. London 1958.

ELLIS (1307a), pp. 71–73, has a popular account in which he calls Josephus the most contemptible denigrator of all. He states that Josephus' remark that Cleopatra trapped Herod into intimacy is one to make Hell shout with laughter.

I have not seen KRAWCZUK (1307b), pp. 214–217, who deals with Herod and Cleopatra.

LINDSAY (1307c), p. 241, notes that attempts have been made to show that Antony visited Cleopatra in 38, but that this visit, which is inherently more than unlikely, is based upon an error in Josephus, who puts Egypt instead of Athens (Ant. 14. 447). LINDSAY, pp. 258–259, comments briefly on Herod's controversy with Cleopatra in 35 B.C.E.

GRANT (1307d), pp. 159–160, concludes that Herod's two main assertions (Ant. 15. 97–103), that Cleopatra had tried to seduce him and that his friends had with difficulty dissuaded him from killing her, are almost certainly untrue, since the principal aim of Herod and of Cleopatra was to remain on good terms with Antony. It was only later that Herod tried to gain credit with Octavian by saying that he had advised Antony to get rid of her.

BAILLY (1307e), pp. 140–143, presents a popular, uncritical summary of Josephus' account of Cleopatra's meeting with Herod.

VOLKMANN (1307f), pp. 136–138, concludes that Josephus' version of the affair of Cleopatra and Herod is hardly credible. Herod, he notes, later joined the side of Octavian and consequently wanted to win favor with him by showing how he had resisted Cleopatra's advances.

#### 14.16: Herod as Messiah

- (1308) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *King Herod: the Man and His Work* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1960. Trans. into German by JEHOCHUA AMIR: *König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk* (Studia Judaica, 4). Berlin 1968.
- (1309) WOLF WIRGIN: *On King Herod's Messianism*. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 11, 1961, pp. 153–154.
- (1310) WOLF WIRGIN: *Bemerkungen zu dem Artikel über „Die Herkunft des Herodes.“* In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 3, 1964, pp. 151–154.

- (1311) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Die 'herodianischen' Patriarchen und der 'davidische' Herodes. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 6, 1967–68, pp. 114–123.
- (1312) ERNST HAMMERSCHMIDT: Königsideologie im spätantiken Judentum. In: *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 113, 1963–64, pp. 493–511.

SCHALIT (1308), in particular, noting that the fourth-century Epiphanius (Panarion, Heresy 20. 1) mentions that the Herodians called Herod *χριστός*, has stressed that Herod had Messianic aspirations.

WIRGIN (1309) notes that this theory is supported by Herod's portrayal on coins in a manner similar to Castor and Pollux, the Savior-gods. We may suggest, however, that the Jews would not have seen the parallel, and that even if they had seen it, they would have resented it. In general, we may note, Herod was aware of Jewish sensibilities in not putting images or his portrait on coins.

WIRGIN (1310) reiterates his view, asserting that Herod's coins do have non-Jewish symbols, thus showing that Herod's Messianism was different from that of the prophets. As Messiah, says WIRGIN, Herod must have regarded it as his task to free Israel from foreign rule, but he realized that this was impossible. We may comment, however, that the concept of the Messiah and of his functions was still very fluid at this time, as we see from the Talmud, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Pseudepigrapha.

SCHALIT (1311) further discusses Herod's Messianism and, in particular, the significance of the statement (Ant. 14. 455) that Herod was *θεοφιλής* ('beloved of G-d') – Theodore's assertion connecting Herod with the Jewish patriarchs.

HAMMERSCHMIDT (1312) says that Herod, realizing that because of his Edomite descent he could not attain power as high priest, sought, in compensation, recognition as the Messiah, as SCHALIT has shown.

### 14.17: Herod's Death

- (1313) ISIDORE LÉVY: Les deux Livres des Maccabées et le livre hébraïque des Hasmonéens. In: *Semítica* 5, 1955, pp. 15–36.
- (1314) JOSEF MEYSHAN: Diagnosis of the Mortal Diseases of Herod the Great and Herod Agrippa (in Hebrew). In: *Harefuah* 53, 1957, pp. 154–155.
- (1315) A. T. SANDISON: The Last Illness of Herod the Great, King of Judaea. In: *Medical History* 11. 4, 1967, pp. 381–388.

LÉVY (1313) draws an interesting comparison between the last illness of Herod (War 1. 647–656 and Antiquities 17. 146–170) and the final illness of Antiochus Epiphanes (II Maccabees 9. 5) and suggests that the biography of Herod, which was Josephus' prime source, furnished the author of II Maccabees with the elements of his account. But, we may reply, it is always possible that both (and Agrippa I as well) had the same disease.

MEYSHAN (1314) diagnoses the disease which caused the deaths of Herod and of his grandson Agrippa I, namely a malignant tumor of the pancreas with metastases in the peritoneum and thorax and thrombosis of veins of the abdomen and lower extremities.



SANDISON (1315), basing himself on War 1. 656ff. and Antiquities 17. 168ff., declares that Josephus has given us a detailed and probably reliable picture of Herod's last days. Herod's death may have been due to a combination of congestive cardiac failure and terminal uraemia with traumatic myiasis of the genitalia. Alternative diagnoses are hepatic cirrhosis and amoebic dysentery.

#### 14.18: The Aftermath of Herod's Death

- (1316) ROBERT EISLER: Hebrew Scrolls: Further Evidence for Their Pre-Christian Date. In: The Modern Churchman 39, 1949, pp. 284–287.
- (1317) WILLIAM R. FARMER: Judas, Simon and Athronges. In: New Testament Studies 4, 1957–58, pp. 147–155.
- (1318) WALTHER JOHN: Zu den Familienverhältnissen des P. Quinctilius Varus. In: Hermes 86, 1958, pp. 251–255.
- (1319) MARIANUS DE JONGE: κρίω, χριστός, αντίχριστος, κρίσμα, χριστιανοί: Philo and Josephus. In: GERHARD KITTEL, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 9. Stuttgart 1973. Pp. 511–512.

EISLER (1316) identifies the *Gibor* in the Dead Sea Scrolls' 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness' with the royal slave Simon of Peraea (War 2. 57–59; Ant. 17. 273–277; Tacitus, Histories 5. 9), who usurped power after the death of Herod; but there is little evidence in Josephus to support this suggestion other than the statement that Simon plundered Jericho, which is not far from the Dead Sea.

FARMER (1317) suggests that Judas, Simon, and Athronges, the three brigands who sought the throne after Herod's death (War 2. 56–65; Ant. 17. 271–284), may have rested their royal claims upon the basis of Maccabean descent; but, we may comment, the only evidence that he offers of such descent is the names of Judas and Simon (which, however, were not merely familiar Maccabean names but extremely common names in general, as inscriptions and literary evidence in the Talmud show); and the assertion, for which there is no evidence, that Athronges was the son of the last Hasmonean king Antigonus has even less to recommend it. His suggestion that Josephus' source might have been ignorant of such Maccabean connections or that he purposely suppressed such information seems unlikely in view of Josephus' explicit statement (Ant. 17. 278) that Athronges, at least, was not distinguished by the position of his ancestors.

JOHN (1318), commenting on the Roman governor of Syria, Varus, who put down the brigandage which ensued in Judaea after Herod's death, notes the contradiction between War 2. 68, which says that Varus' friend Gaius was responsible for the capture of Sepphoris, and Antiquities 17. 288, which says that it was his son who achieved this, though he does state that Varus turned over part of his army to one of his friends, presumably Gaius, for this purpose. JOHN suggests that Josephus had a corrupt source and was himself careless and is here to be corrected by the version in Seneca the Elder's 'Controversiae' and in inscriptions.

DE JONGE (1319) remarks that it is noteworthy that Josephus does not describe as messiahs Judas ben Hiskiah, Simon, and Athronges, who claimed the throne after Herod's death.

### 14.19: The Herodian Family in General

- (1320) R. E. HARLAN: Evidence of the Hellenistic Influence of the Herods upon New Testament History. Diss., Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky 1943.
- (1321) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: Exils et tombeaux des Hérodes. In: *Revue Biblique* 53, 1946, pp. 56–74.
- (1322) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Asinius Pollio and His Jewish Interests, In: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 84, 1953, pp. 73–80.
- (1323) FRITZ-OTTO BUSCH (= PETER CORNELISSEN, pseudonym): Was begab sich aber zu der Zeit. Hamburg 1956 (= Gold und Myrrhe. Die Herodier und ihre Zeit. Hannover 1956). Trans. into English by ERNEST W. DICKES: *The Five Herods*. London 1958.
- (1324) FRITZ-OTTO BUSCH: Die Bibel nennt ihre Namen. Gestalten und Ereignisse der großen Zeitenwende 100 v. Chr. bis 100 n. Chr. im Land der Bibel (Heyne Sachbuch, no. 41). München 1965.
- (1325) STEWART PEROWNE: The Later Herods: The Political Background of the New Testament. London 1958. Trans. into German by HARTMUT SCHMÖKEL: *Herodier, Römer und Juden*. Stuttgart 1958.
- (1326) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Herodes und seine Nachfolger. In: HANS J. SCHULTZ, ed., *Kontexte*, vol. 3. Stuttgart 1966. Pp. 34–42.
- (1327) MARIO PANI: Roma e i re d'oriente da Augusto a Tiberio (Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Bari). Bari 1972.
- (1327a) A. KINDLER: A Coin of Herod Philip – the Earliest Portrait of a Herodian Ruler. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 21, 1971, pp. 161–163.

I have not seen HARLAN's (1320) dissertation.

ABEL (1321) is a survey, with emphasis on the archaeological remains, of Antipater, Phasael, Joseph (son of Antipater), Mariamne, Pheroras, Herod's sons Alexander and Aristobulus, Antipater son of Herod, the Herodeion, Archelaus, Philip the Tetrarch, Antipas and Herodias, and Agrippa I and II.

I (1322) identify the Pollio (Ant. 15. 343) to whose home in Rome Herod sent his sons to complete their education as Asinius Pollio, Julius Caesar's confidant, and suggest that by having them stay at the home of Pollio, who apparently was friendly to Judaism, he was attempting to have them educated in an atmosphere sympathetic to Judaism.

BUSCH (1323)(1324) has popular accounts of Herod I, Herod Archelaus, Herod Antipas, Herod Agrippa I, and Herod Agrippa II, as well as a chapter on the destruction of Jerusalem and a brief account of Josephus' life.

PEROWNE (1325) has a popular account which follows Josephus closely. It is delightful in its style, though as noted above, definitely biased in favor of Herod.

SCHALIT (1326) presents a brief popular survey attempting to rehabilitate Herod and his successors.

PANI (1327) concentrates, in particular, on Archelaus, the king of Cappadocia, whose daughter married Herod's son Alexander. In a learned and in-

genious, but ultimately unconvincing, argument, he claims that Josephus' account of Archelaus is inaccurate, that it was Archelaus who was actually behind the plot to kill Herod, and that Herod's sons Alexander and Aristobulus had actually engaged in the plot against Herod only because they could rely on Alexander's father-in-law. Josephus, we may comment, was certainly aware (Ant. 16. 325) of the fact that Herod had charged Archelaus with having plotted with Alexander against him. If this charge were true, we may ask, what motive would Josephus have to withhold this conclusion?

KINDLER (1327a) notes that whereas Herod Archelaus and Herod Antipas had, in deference to Jewish religious sensibilities, avoided representation of pagan emblems on coins, their brother Herod Philip, who ruled over a predominantly non-Jewish population, took the liberty to mint coins with his own likeness and that of the Emperor upon them.

#### 14.20: Phasael and Archelaus

(1328) BERNDT SCHALLER: Phasael. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplement 12, 1970, cols. 1084–1086.

(1329) W. REES: Archelaus, Son of Herod. In: *Scripture* 4, 1951, pp. 348–355.

SCHALLER (1328) asserts that Josephus, who is here following his source Nicolaus of Damascus, is unjustified in placing Phasael entirely in the shadow of his brother Herod.

REES (1329) suggests that Josephus does not give the full story of Archelaus' fall and infers from Strabo and Dio Cassius that the charge against him was disloyalty to Rome. To judge from parallel dismissals by Roman emperors, we may comment, it seems not unlikely that Archelaus' accusers charged him with disloyalty to Rome: the anger of the Emperor (Ant. 17. 343) and the punishment of banishment would be consonant with this theory.

#### 14.21: Herod Antipas and Herodias

(1330) VICTOR E. HARLOW: *The Destroyer of Jesus: The Story of Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee*. Oklahoma City 1953; 1954.

(1331) JACOB JERVELL: Herodes Antipas og hans plass i evangelieoverleveringen (i.e. Herod Antipas and His Place in the Gospel Tradition). In: *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 61, 1960, pp. 28–40.

(1332) WALTER OTTO: Herodes I. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplement 2, 1913, cols. 1–205.

(1333) GUY SCHOFIELD: *Crime before Calvary: Herodias, Herod Antipas, and Pontius Pilate: A New Interpolation*. London 1960.

(1334) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: Herod Antipas, Tetrarch of Galilee and Peraea. In: *Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society* 5, 1963–65, pp. 6–23.

(1335) HAROLD W. HOEHNER: *Herod Antipas*. Cambridge 1972.

(1336) LÉON HERRMANN: Hérodiade. In: *Revue des Études juives* 132, 1973, pp. 49–63.

- (1337) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: Exils et tombeaux des Hérodes. In: *Revue Biblique* 53, 1946, pp. 56–74.
- (1338) HENRI CROUZEL: Le lieu d'exil d'Hérode Antipas et l'Hérodiade selon Flavius Josèphe. In: *Studia Patristica* 10.1 (Texte und Untersuchungen, vol. 107). East Berlin 1970. Pp. 275–280.
- (1339) HENRI CROUZEL: L'exil d'Hérode Antipas et d'Hérodiade à Lugdunum Convenarum (Saint-Bertrand-des-Comminges). In: *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 72, 1971, pp. 224–225.
- (1340) LUCETTA MOWRY: A Greek Inscription at Jathum in Transjordan. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 132, 1953, pp. 34–41.
- (1340a) MANFRED LÄMMER: Griechische Wettkämpfe in Galiläa unter der Herrschaft des Herodes Antipas. In: *Kölner Beiträge zur Sportwissenschaft* 5, 1976, pp. 37–67.

HARLOW (1330) presents a vivid, popular account of Herod Antipas, marked by uncritical use of Josephus.

JERVELL (1331) attempts to correct the portrayal of OTTO (1332) by making Antipas more of a Jewish nationalist and less of a Hellenizer and friend of the Romans.

SCHOFIELD (1333) presents a popular, speculative, and journalistic reconstruction of events.

BRUCE (1334) has a general survey of Antipas' life. As to the account in *Antiquities* 18. 101–105, he concludes that there is no reason for doubting Josephus' accuracy, since his personal interests were not involved.

HOEHNER (1335), who shows little or no acquaintance with Hebrew sources, ancient or modern, says that Josephus is biased against Antipas and in favor of his opponents Agrippa I and the latter's son Agrippa II. He is skeptical of Josephus' statement that Antipas conspired with Sejanus against Tiberius (*Ant.* 18. 250), since this accusation is never proven. Unfortunately HOEHNER tries too hard to clear the Galileans of the charge of being political rebels.

HERRMANN (1336) presents a critical examination of the traditions about Herodias in Josephus, in the Slavonic Josephus (2. 9. 7 = *War* 2. 168), the New Testament, and the 'Sibylline Oracles' (1. 336–337), and concludes that in all these sources, especially the Slavonic Josephus and the New Testament, there are preconceived views which distort historical reality. He prefers the account in the authentic texts of Josephus which makes no mention of Herodias' complicity in John's death. As to Josephus' statement making her responsible for the disgrace and exile of Herod Antipas, he remarks that this may reflect Josephus' partiality to Agrippa I, who was on bad terms with his sister Herodias.

ABEL (1337), noting that according to *Antiquities* 18. 252, Antipas and his wife Herodias were exiled to Lyons in Gaul, whereas, according to *War* 2. 183, they were banished to Spain, concludes that the hypothesis that they were exiled to Lugdunum Convenarum (modern Comminges) in the French Pyrenees (where there is a very ancient local tradition that Herod and Herodias sojourned) is attractive but not conclusive.

CROUZEL (1338)(1339) is more positive in accepting this tradition. He rightly concludes that Strabo could not have meant Antipas in 16. 2, 46, where he speaks of a son of Herod exiled among the Gallic Allobroges (which would favor Lyons in Gaul), but rather Archelaus, who indeed was exiled to Gaul

according to Antiquities 17. 15. Strabo, as CROUZEL notes, died in 23/24, whereas Antipas was not exiled until 39.

MOWRY (1340) infers from the manner in which Aretas' daughter, Herod the Tetrarch's divorced wife, was taken under the protection of one στρατηγός after another (Ant. 18. 112) and finally delivered to the fortress of Machaerus that such territories were under the control of local native officials and that their authority was limited to their own particular region.

I have not seen LÄMMER (1340a).

## 15: The Period after Herod until the Outbreak of the War against the Romans

### 15.0: Josephus on Parthian Affairs (Antiquities 18. 39–52, etc.)

- (1341) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on Parthian Affairs (Ant. xviii. 39–52, etc.). Appendix H. In: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. Pp. 567–568.
- (1342) NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE: A Political History of Parthia. Chicago 1938.
- (1343) ALFRED VON GUTSCHMID: Geschichte Irans und seiner Nachbarländer. Tübingen 1888.
- (1344) WERNER SCHUR: Parthia. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., Real-encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 18.3, 1949, cols. 1968–2029.
- (1345) CARSTEN COLPE: Die Arsakiden bei Josephus. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 97–108.
- (1346) ULRICH KAHRSTEDT: Artabanos III und seine Erben. Berlin 1950.
- (1347) ALBINO GARZETTI: La data dell'incontro all' Eufrate di Artabano III et L. Vitellio legato di Siria. In: Studi Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni. Vol. 1. Milan 1956. Pp. 211–229.
- (1348) KARL-HEINZ ZIEGLER: Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts. Wiesbaden 1964.
- (1349) EUGEN TÄUBLER: Die Parthernachrichten bei Josephus. Berlin 1904.
- (1350) HILDEGARDE LEWY: The Genesis of the Faulty Persian Chronology. In: Journal of the American Oriental Society 64, 1944, pp. 197–214.
- (1351) CHESTER C. McCOWN: Epigraphic Gleanings in Transjordan. In: Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 66, 1937, pp. 19–21.
- (1352) B. SIMONETTA: Note di numismatica partica. Vonone II, Vologese I e Vardane II. In: Rivista Italiana di Numismatica 60, 1958, pp. 3–10.
- (1352a) ISAAH GAFNI: Babylonian Jewry and Its Institutions in the Period of the Talmud (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1975.
- (1352b) ISAAH GAFNI: The Jewish Community of Babylonia. In: Immanuel 8, 1978. pp. 58–68.
- (1352c) JACOB NEUSNER: The Jews East of the Euphrates and the Roman Empire. I. 1st–3rd Centuries A.D. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, vol. 2.9.1, 1976. Pp. 46–69.
- (1352d) GEO WIDENGREN: The Status of the Jews in the Sassanian Empire. In: Iranica Antiqua 1, 1961, pp. 117–162.
- (1352e) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: Studies in the Language and Historiography of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Ph.D., Brown University, Providence 1976.

A select bibliography on this subject will be found in my Loeb volume (1341).

DEBEVOISE (1342) is, on the whole, a disappointing book which tends to follow GUTSCHMID (1343) without showing much originality and making little use of the discoveries at Dura-Europos. He notes how often Josephus' account of Parthian affairs has been confirmed from numismatic sources. When Josephus and Tacitus cover the same ground, Josephus is, he contends, regularly to be preferred.

SCHUR (1344) regularly follows Tacitus, especially when supported by numismatic finds, against Josephus. We may suggest that Josephus' knowledge of Aramaic, the language of populous Jewish communities in Babylonia, might well have given him a more direct knowledge of events involving the Parthians than was available to Tacitus.

COLPE (1345) traces Josephus' anti-Parthian bias in the major passages dealing with Parthian history before the dynasty of Phraates IV (38 B.C.E.) and notes a more objective and more reliable approach in the passages dealing with matters from the time of Augustus on. The change, he suggests, is due to the fact that the Romans had, in the meantime, concluded treaties with the Parthians; hence Josephus has no ground to display hatred for the Parthians.

KAHRSTADT (1346) has a not always convincing attempt to co-ordinate Josephus with other sources, particularly with respect to the Parthian kings Gotarzes and Vardanes, as well as with regard to Izates. He rejects the statement of Josephus (Ant. 18. 48) that Artabanus was king of Media before he became king of Parthia on the ground that it is contradicted by Tacitus (Annals 2. 31 and 6. 36. 4), but, as noted above, there is good reason to believe that Tacitus is a less reliable source for Parthian affairs than is Josephus.

GARZETTI (1347), on the basis of Antiquities 18. 96–100, among other citations, reaches a date at the end of the spring or the beginning of the summer of 37 for the meeting of Artabanus III and Vitellius.

ZIEGLER (1348), pp. 45–96, follows GUTSCHMID (1343) and TÄUBLER (1349) in accepting Josephus' account of the meeting on the Euphrates between Artabanus III and Vitellius (Ant. 18. 101–102), as against the accounts of Suetonius (Caligula 14. 3) and Dio Cassius (59. 27. 3). He rightly regards the dinner given by Herod the tetrarch on this occasion as merely opportunistic. ZIEGLER seeks to see in this meeting a step toward the development of acceptance by the Romans of parity with Parthia; but, as ZIEGLER admits, even Josephus' version concedes that the Parthians sent gifts and hostages to the Romans.

LEWY (1350) acknowledges Josephus' reliability in matters pertaining to Babylonia. She also accepts the Persian tradition that it was King Gudarz who is the nameless leader who destroyed Anilaeus' army. As to Josephus' account of Phraataces' marriage to his mother Musa (Thesmusa, Ant. 18. 39–43), she notes that Darius I had similarly legitimized his rule by marrying the sister-wife Atossa of his predecessor Cambyses and her sister Artystone (Herodotus 3. 88, 7. 69, 7. 72). Again, Josephus' statement (Ant. 18. 374) that Seleucia was in the hands of the Greeks is substantiated by Tacitus (Annals 6. 42).

MCCOWN (1351) asserts that the closest parallel to the name Κόνειμος found on a sarcophagus in Marwa in Transjordan is Κύνναμος, the Parthian king

mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 20. 63–65); but, we may comment, he goes too far in seeking to identify them.

SIMONETTA (1352) uses numismatic evidence in dating the reigns of the Parthian kings (Ant. 20. 69–74) Vonones II (December, 51) and Vologeses (September, 51 – March, 50) and in determining the blood-relationships among them.

GAFNI (1352a) has a collection of sources, including Josephus, with very brief narrative and notes, on Babylonian Jewry, with emphasis on Asinaeus and Anilaeus (Ant. 18. 310–373) and the conversion of Adiabene (Ant. 20. 17–96).

GAFNI (1352b), in a brief summary, uncritical of Josephus, has a translation of the introduction to his 'Babylonian Jewry and Its Institutions in the Period of the Talmud'. He concludes that the Babylonian Jews shared the animosity of the Parthians against the Romans, and that the feudal regime of the Parthian rulers permitted the Babylonian Jews to live according to the special way of Judaism and thus to substitute the Parthian rulers for the Romans.

NEUSNER (1352c), pp. 48ff., deals with the accounts of the Parthians in Josephus. He finds in Antiquities 12. 419–421 historical foundation for the story of a Parthian embassy to Alexander Jannaeus, as mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud (Berakhoth 7. 2, Nazir 5. 3), inasmuch as the successes of Tigranes I of Armenia alarmed both Jannaeus and the Parthians, and it would thus certainly have made sense for the Parthians to come to an agreement with Jannaeus to oppose a power threatening both nations.

WIDENGREN (1352d) notes that political relations between the Jews and the Parthians were sometimes very close in fighting their common enemy, the Romans. In particular, a close relation existed between the Jews of Palestine and Mesopotamia, on the one hand, and the Parthian vassal kingdom of Adiabene, on the other hand, under its Jewish royal house.

LADOUCEUR (1352e), commenting on Roman-Parthian relations, concludes that Josephus selects his references to Parthia very carefully. His omission of amicable relations between Jews and Parthians may be due to his realistic conviction that Jewish welfare was closely bound up with the Romans rather than with dreams of Parthian victory.

### 15.1: The Autonomous Jewish State of Anilaeus and Asinaeus under the Parthians

- (1353) GEO WIDENGREN: Quelques rapports entre Juifs et Iraniens à l'époque des Parthes. In: Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 4 (Volume du Congrès. Strasbourg 1956). Leiden 1957. Pp. 197–241.
- (1354) MOSHE GREENBERG: Another Look at Rachel's Theft of the Teraphim. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 81, 1962, pp. 239–248.
- (1355) JACOB NEUSNER: Parthian Political Ideology. In: Iranica Antiqua 3, 1963, pp. 40–59.
- (1356) JACOB NEUSNER: A History of the Jews in Babylonia. Vol. 1: The Parthian Period. Leiden 1965; 2nd ed., 1969.
- (1357) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews'. In: Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 4, 1965, pp. 163–188. Trans.



into German by JAKOB MITTELMANN in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed., *Zur Josephus-Forschung* (Wege der Forschung, 84). Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 367–400.

- (1358) NAOMI G. COHEN: Asinaeus and Anilaus: Additional Comments to Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews'. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 10, 1975–76, pp. 30–37.

WIDENGREN (1353) comments, in particular, on assimilation to Parthian ways as seen notably in the case of Asinaeus and Anilaus (Ant. 18. 310–379) and their disregard of the Jewish laws of marriage.

GREENBERG (1354) cites the Parthian general's wife with whom Anilaus had an affair and who followed her ancestral custom in taking her household gods with her when she left home as explaining the motive of Rachel's theft of the household gods in Genesis 31. 19.

NEUSNER (1355), pp. 51–54, (1356), pp. 50–58, argues that Josephus' account of the robber-barons Anilaus and Asinaeus is plausible, since Jewish autonomy would secure peace for vital territories near the capital and exploit connections with the Jews in Roman Palestine. Of course, we may add, it was not the Parthians' original intention to tolerate such a state, but when the brothers prevailed in battle they made a virtue of necessity.

SCHALIT (1357) ingeniously discerns an Aramaic word *ketila* in Antiquities 18. 343 (κτιλίων, κτιτών) and concludes that Antiquities 18. 310–379, dealing with Asinaeus and Anilaus, lay before Josephus in a Greek translation which goes back to an Aramaic original. He similarly finds evidence of an Aramaic source behind Antiquities 20. 17–90 on Izates, because μεγαλορρήμονα (Ant. 20. 90), "speaking big", is a translation of Daniel 7. 8 and 20; and since this is an integral part of Izates' prayer, which was presumably originally composed in Aramaic, the language of Adiabene, the whole story of Izates was in Aramaic. The word κτιλίων is certainly strange, and the fact that there are so many variants in the manuscripts is an indication that copyists through the ages found it hard to understand; it may thus well be that the word is Aramaic, which indeed was the language of the Jews of Babylonia. However, we may object, the phrase containing μεγαλορρήμονα is found only in the *editio princeps* and not in any of the manuscripts; and since this word is also found in the Septuagint version of Psalm 11 (12). 4, there is no proof that this passage goes back to the Aramaic of Daniel (the Septuagint version of which has a different translation, λαλοῦν μέγала, for this phrase).

COHEN (1358) provides additional support for SCHALIT's theory that Josephus' source at second-hand for the Asinaeus-Anilaus episode was in Aramaic. She concludes that the trade to which the orphan lads had originally been apprenticed by their mother (Ant. 18. 314) was not weaving but the manufacture of scale armor, the Aramaic homonym having been mistranslated.

## 15.2: Josephus on Arab Affairs (cf. 25.21)

- (1358a) FRANZ ALTHEIM and RUTH STIEHL: *Die Araber in der Alten Welt*. Vol. 1. Berlin 1964.  
 (1358b) JOHN I. LAWLOR: *The Nabataeans in Historical Perspective*. Grand Rapids 1974.

- (1358c) MEL WACKS: Judaeen Jottings: Rex Aretas. In: *Shekel* 9.6, Nov.–Dec. 1976, pp. 17–19.
- (1358d) AVRAHAM NEGEV: The Nabateans and the Provincia Arabia. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Vol. 2.8, 1977, pp. 520–686.

ALTHEIM and STIEHL (1358a), pp. 350–354, correlate *Antiquities* 14. 77ff., on the Ituraeans and Edessa, with the numismatic evidence.

LAWLOR (1358b), in a disappointing work which shows acquaintance with secondary works in English only, comments, in particular, on Josephus as an historical source (pp. 18–19), on Aretas III (pp. 34–46), on Malchus II and his wars against the Jews (pp. 51–65), on Obadas II and Syllaeus (pp. 91–101), on Aretas IV and Nabataean maturity (pp. 103–118), on Abias the Arab's battle with Izates (pp. 119–120), and on Malchus III (pp. 121–122).

I have not seen WACKS (1358c). [See *infra*, p. 926.]

NEGEV (1358d) frequently cites Josephus, noting his lacunae and improbabilities in co-ordinating him with archaeological finds in his history of the late Persian and Hellenistic periods through the middle Nabataean period (30 B.C.E. – 70 C.E.) and the late Nabataean period (70–106 C.E.).

### 15.3: The Ituraeans

- (1358e) SHIMON DOR: The Historical Background of the Settlements of the Hermon (in Hebrew). In: SHIMON APPLEBAUM, ed., *The Hermon and Its Foothills*. Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 142–151.

DOR (1358e) discusses the boundaries of Ituraea, traces the contacts between the Jews and the Ituraeans, and stresses the forced conversion of the Ituraeans by Aristobulus I (*Ant.* 13. 318–319), citing the evidence in Talmudic literature of converts in the region.

### 15.4: Josephus on Petty States in Asia Minor and Vicinity

- (1358f) A. B. BOSWORTH: Arrian and the Alani. In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 81, 1977, pp. 217–255.
- (1358g) RICHARD D. SULLIVAN: The Dynasty of Commagene. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Vol. 2.8, 1977, pp. 732–798.

BOSWORTH (1358f) notes that Josephus (*Ant.* 18. 97) identifies the Sarmatians with the Alani. The Alani, however, cannot have given the Iberians passage through the Caspian Gates, since the Gates were in Iberian territory. Tacitus, however, says explicitly that it was the Iberians who admitted their allies through the Caspian Gates. The *editio princeps* was therefore right in emending to Ἀλανούς in *Antiquities* 18. 97.

SULLIVAN (1358g) cites Josephus often in his account of the dynasty of Commagene, its composition, policies, participation in dynastic intermarriage,

and activity during the period when the empires of the Romans and of the Parthians allied themselves with the dynasties on both sides of the Euphrates.

### 15.5: The Emperor Augustus and the Jews

- (1359) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Edict of Augustus Caesar in Relation to the Judaeans of Asia. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 55, 1964–65, pp. 160–163.

That Josephus' account of Augustus is incomplete, if not slanted, may be deduced from the fact that Suetonius (Augustus 93) mentions that Augustus praised his grandson Gaius for not offering prayers to the Jewish G-d when he visited Jerusalem. To judge from Josephus, Augustus showered favors on the Jews; his omission of this incident, which must have created a stir at the time, can only, we must conclude, be counted as deliberate.

ZEITLIN (1359) comments on Augustus' edict (Ant. 16. 162–165), issued at the intervention of Herod in 8 B.C.E., excusing the Jews of Asia Minor from appearing in court on the Sabbath and on Friday afternoon.

### 15.6: The Emperor Tiberius and the Jews

- (1360) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Expulsion of the Jews by Tiberius (Ant. xviii. 65–84). Appendix L. In: Josephus, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library), London 1965. P. 576.
- (1361) ROBERT S. ROGERS: Tiberius' Travels, A.D. 26–37. In: *Classical Weekly* 39, 1945–46, pp. 42–44.
- (1362) JEAN BÉRANGER: Recherches sur l'Aspect Idéologique du Principat (Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft, no. 6). Basel 1953.
- (1363) ERICH KÖSTERMANN: Der Sturz Sejans. In: *Hermes* 83, 1955, pp. 350–373.
- (1364) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: Some Notes on the Jews under Tiberius. In: *Latomus* 15, 1956, pp. 314–329.
- (1365) HARRY J. LEON: *The Jews of Ancient Rome*. Philadelphia 1960.
- (1366) ERNEST L. ABEL: Were the Jews Banished from Rome in 19 A.D.? In: *Revue des Études juives* 127, 1968, pp. 383–386.
- (1366a) GÉZA ALFÖLDY: La politique provinciale de Tibère. In: *Latomus* 24, 1965, pp. 824–844.
- (1366b) LÉON HERRMANN: Chrestos. Témoignages païens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle. Bruxelles 1970.
- (1366c) WOLFGANG ORTH: Die Provinzialpolitik des Tiberius. Diss., München 1970.
- (1366d) P. W. BARNETT: Under Tiberius All Was Quiet. In: *New Testament Studies* 21, 1974–75, pp. 564–571.

I (1360) have a select bibliography on the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Tiberius.

ROGERS (1361) notes that Tiberius' journey to Tusculum in 36 rests on Josephus' testimony (Ant. 18. 179) alone, but that Josephus had the means to be well-informed; and the considerable detail which he offers adds credibility to his account.

BÉRANGER (1362), discussing the discrepancy between War 2. 180, which gives the length of Tiberius' reign as twenty-two years, six months, and three days, and Antiquities 18. 224, which says that he reigned twenty-two years, five months, and three days, suggests that Josephus had before him a Latin text which read *A XXII M V D III*, and that the stroke of the *D* caused confusion. We may comment that the theory that Josephus used a Latin source is certainly possible, though not proven. Inasmuch as the two texts almost exactly agree, most likely there is a copyist's error, and indeed we may note that the *editio princeps* for Antiquities 18. 224 is in agreement with War 2. 180. The fact that Josephus differs both with Tacitus, who has twenty-two years, six months, and twenty-eight days, and Dio Cassius, who has twenty-two years, seven months, and seven days would indicate that both the 'War' and the 'Antiquities' have a common source which is different from that of Tacitus and Dio. NIESE's theory that Josephus used a Jewish method of computing reigns from the first of Nisan is highly unlikely, since there is no evidence that Jews applied this method, which they used for their own kings, to the kings of other nations; and BÉRANGER rightly rejects it.

KÖSTERMANN (1363) notes that Josephus' report on the plot of Sejanus is supported by Dio's account.

SMALLWOOD (1364) plausibly concludes that the real reason for Tiberius' measures against the Jews in 19 (Ant. 18. 65ff.) was, as Dio contended, Jewish proselytizing, which did indeed, we may note, arouse much resentment because of the 'illiberalism' of the Jews and because of the Jews' tremendous success in their missionary activities at the time. SMALLWOOD rejects Josephus' date (ca. 30) for this expulsion but suggests that this is an indication that Jews were in some kind of trouble at the time.

LEON (1365), pp. 16–20, and ABEL (1366) agree with SMALLWOOD in accepting Dio's version that the Jews were expelled from Rome because of their proselytizing activity. LEON suggests that only the foreigners and freedmen were expelled, and ABEL argues that only the proselytes were driven out, since it would have been contrary to existing law, which Tiberius strictly obeyed, to banish any citizen without a trial. This, we may comment, seems likely, since the Roman writer Tacitus (Annals 2. 85. 4), who is most hostile to the Jews, speaks of 4,000 freedmen being sent to Sardinia; and Suetonius, who is likewise hostile to them, is careful to mention the proselytes as included in the expulsion.

ALFÖLDY (1366a) notes epigraphical evidence, as well as Suetonius and Tacitus, confirming Antiquities 18. 169–178, concerning Tiberius' practice of keeping functionaries in provinces for long periods. In general, he concludes, Tiberius appointed capable men at the head of provinces, but some of his appointees were personages of lesser ability, such as Calpurnius Piso and Pilate.

HERRMANN (1366b), pp. 15–18, comments on Thallus, the Samaritan freedman of Tiberius (Ant. 18. 167, according to the emendation of HUDSON), and the repression in Judaea and in Rome under Tiberius (Ant. 18. 69ff., 81ff.).

ORTH (1366c), pp. 46–47, says that the authenticity of Tiberius' fable of the flies (Ant. 18. 174–175) remains highly questionable, since it is not clear from what source the author drew, though he declares his view that Josephus is

here presenting Tiberius' own words. He furthermore notes (pp. 72–73) that Josephus in his statement (Ant. 18. 170) that Tiberius did not replace governors or procurators unless they died at their posts is an exaggeration, since Josephus knows (Ant. 18. 35, 18. 177) that Valerius Gratus was replaced in Judaea in 26. According to ORTH the passivity of Tiberius stressed by Josephus reflects a complex and troubled personality. ORTH corrects Josephus' picture of Tiberius' effectiveness as an administrator by noting the insurrections in Thrace, Gaul, Frisia, Cappadocia, and Africa, due to under-development economically and to exploitation of natural resources and abuses of provincial governors.

BARNETT (1366d) differentiates the period between 6 and 44, when there were relatively few instances of disorder in Judaea, from the period from 44 to 66, when serious revolutionary activity began. He ascribes the stability of the earlier period to the policies of the Emperors Augustus and Tiberius and to the tenure of the family of Ananus as high priests. Tacitus (Histories 5. 9–10) supports the picture of Josephus that all was quiet under Tiberius. BARNETT, however, admits that affairs in Judaea were extremely delicate between the arrival of Pilate and the fall of Sejanus, and stresses that there were only three incidents, which, he says, may be aspects of a single disturbance, in which there was bloodshed. Significantly, Tacitus notes no disturbances between the death of Herod and Caligula's proposal to desecrate the Temple.

### 15.7: The Roman Procurators before Pontius Pilate

- (1367) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Roman Procurators (except Pontius Pilate) (Ant. xviii. 31–35, etc.). Appendix G. In: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. P. 566.
- (1368) HANS G. PFLAUM: Les Procurateurs équestres sous le haut-empire romain. Diss., Paris 1950. Published also as an independent monograph.
- (1369) EDUARD LOHSE: Die römischen Statthalter in Jerusalem. In: Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins 74, 1958, pp. 69–78.
- (1370) S. REYERO: Los textos de Flavio Josefo y de Filón sobre la residencia de los procuradores romanos en Jerusalén. In: Studium (Avila) 1–2, 1961–62, pp. 527–555.
- (1371) YITZHAK ISAAC HALEVY (RABINOWITZ): Generations of Old (in Hebrew). Vol. 4, part 1, ed. MOSHE AUERBACH: The Last Period of the Second Temple: The Time of the Roman Procurators and the War. Benei Beraq 1964.
- (1372) MENAHEM STERN: Sympathy for Judaism in Roman Senatorial Circles in the Period of the Early Empire (in Hebrew). In: Zion 29, 1964, pp. 155–167.
- (1373) RONALD SYME: The Roman Revolution. Oxford 1939.
- (1373a) HENRY WANSBROUGH: Suffered unter Pontius Pilate. In: Scripture 18, 1966, pp. 84–93.
- (1373b) ERNST Bammel: Die Blutgerichtsbarkeit in der römischen Provinz Judaea vor dem ersten jüdischen Aufstand. In: Journal of Jewish Studies 25, 1974, 35–49.

I (1367) have a select bibliography on the Roman procurators (excluding Pilate).

PFLAUM (1368), pp. 146–151, in an exhaustive work, stresses that the procurators were subordinate to the governors of the province of Syria.

LOHSE (1369) has a survey co-ordinating Josephus and the New Testament as to the procurators, particularly in their relation to the Jewish Sanhedrin.

I have not seen REYERO (1370).

HALEVY (1371) has a survey of the whole period which is chiefly concerned with co-ordinating Josephus and the Talmud.

STERN (1372) notes the differences in attitude towards the Jews between the Roman governors of Syria, who belonged to the senatorial order, and the procurators of Judaea, who were of equestrian rank and frequently of Oriental-Greek extraction and who thus tended to favor the Hellenistic urban population which was hostile to the Jews. We may comment that the difference between the senatorial and equestrian ranks had narrowed by imperial times; and Augustus in particular, as noted by SYME (1373), conferred the *latus clavus* on many young men of equestrian stock, encouraging them to stand for the office of the quaestorship and to enter the Senate. Moreover, the favorable attitude toward the Jews of such a governor as Petronius may simply reflect a greater sense of responsibility and better administration.

WANSBROUGH (1373a) remarks that Josephus must have known that Coponius, the first procurator, took some part in the rebuilding of the Temple, since one of the gates of the great court was named after him. Yet, he does not mention this, since he has no interest in telling us about the conciliatory actions of the Roman administrators. We may, however, suggest that perhaps Coponius' action was intended merely to cover up his maladministration.

BAMMEL (1373b) discusses capital punishment under the procurators (War 2. 117, 232–233; Ant. 18. 2; Ant. 20. 118–124, 200–203).

## 15.8: Pontius Pilate: General

- (1374) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on Pontius Pilate, Especially His Dismissal from the Procuratorship (Ant. xviii. 60–62, 85–89). Appendix J. In: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. Pp. 571–572.
- (1375) ALBERT T. E. OLMSTEAD: The Chronology of Jesus' Life. In: Anglican Theological Review 24, 1942, pp. 1–26.
- (1376) ETHELBERG STAUFFER: Zur Münzprägung und Judenpolitik des Pontius Pilate. In: La Nouvelle Clio 1–2, 1949–50, pp. 495–514.
- (1377) ERNST BAMMEL: Syrian Coinage and Pilate. In: Journal of Jewish Studies 2, 1950–51, pp. 108–110.
- (1378) ERICH FASCHER: Pilatus, Pontius. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 20. 2, 1950, cols. 1322–1323.
- (1379) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity. London 1951.
- (1380) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: Pontius Pilate in History and Legend. In: History Today 18, 1968, pp. 523–530. Rpt. in his: Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men, and Events. New York 1969. Pp. 254–267.
- (1381) SALVATORE GAROFALO: Ponzio Pilato, procuratore della Giudea. In: Quaderni ACI (Associazioni culturale italiana) 9, 1952, pp. 55–70.
- (1382) LOUIS GIRARD: Le cadre chronologique du ministère de Jésus. Paris 1953.

- (1383) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: The Date of the Dismissal of Pontius Pilate from Judaea. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5, 1954, pp. 12–21.
- (1384) ROGER CAILLOIS: Ponce Pilate. Paris 1961. Trans. into English by CHARLES L. MARKMANN: Pontius Pilate. New York 1963.
- (1385) PAUL WINTER: On the Trial of Jesus (*Studia Judaica: Forschungen zur Wissenschaft des Judentums*, ed. ERNST L. EHRLICH, Bd. 1). Berlin 1961.
- (1386) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Pilate, Pontius. In: *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 3, Nashville, Tennessee 1962, pp. 811–813.
- (1387) IAN H. EYBERS: The Roman Administration of Judea between A.D. 6 and 41. In: *Theologia Evangelica* 2, 1969, pp. 131–146.
- (1388) PAUL L. MAIER: Pontius Pilate. Garden City, New York 1968. Trans. into German by HANSJÜRGEN WILLE and BARBARA KLAU: Pilatus: sein Leben und seine Zeit nach Dokumenten. Wuppertal 1970.
- (1389) PAUL L. MAIER: The Fate of Pontius Pilate. In: *Hermes* 99, 1971, pp. 362–371.
- (1389a) MARTA SORDI: Sui primi rapporti dell'autorità romana con il cristianesimo (A proposito della cronologia degli 'Atti'). In: *Studi Romani* 8, 1960, pp. 393–409.
- (1389b) C. D. PEDDINGHAUS: Die Entstehung der Leidensgeschichte. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und historische Untersuchung des Werdens und Wachsens der erzählenden Passionstradition bis zum Entwurf des Marcus. Diss. Heidelberg 1965.
- (1389c) H. E. W. TURNER: The Chronological Framework of the Ministry. In: DENNIS E. NINEHAM et al., *Historicity and Chronology in the New Testament*. (Theological Collections, 6). London 1965. Pp. 59–74.
- (1389d) WERNER KOCH: Der Prozess Jesu. Versuch eines Tatsachenberichts. Köln 1966.
- (1389e) HENRY WANSBROUGH: Suffered under Pontius Pilate. In: *Scripture* 18, 1966, pp. 84–93.
- (1389f) PAUL L. MAIER: Sejanus, Pilate, and the Date of the Crucifixion. In: *Church History* 37, 1968, pp. 3–13.
- (1389g) ROBERT M. GRANT: The Trial of Jesus in the Light of History. In: *Judaism* 20, 1971, pp. 37–42.
- (1389h) HAIM COHN: Une nouvelle théorie sur le procès de Jésus. In: *Les Dossiers de l'Archéologie*, no. 10, 1975, pp. 93–97.
- (1389i) KURT A. SPEIDEL: Das Urteil des Pilatus. Bilder und Berichte zur Passion Jesu. Stuttgart 1976.

I (1374) have a select bibliography on Pilate.

OLMSTEAD (1375) agrees with Luke in dating Pilate's procuratorship and convincingly argues that Josephus' order of events in 'Antiquities', Book 18, was never intended to be chronological.

STAUFFER (1376) concludes that the coins agree with Josephus and Philo, as well as with the New Testament, in indicating that Pilate's policy was calculated to provoke the Jews and was in accordance with Sejanus' plan for a 'final solution' for the Jewish problem and in countering the widely prevalent scholarly view that Pilate was an energetic administrator.

BAMMEL (1377) agrees that Pilate's coinage was indeed provocative, thus contradicting the common view that in their coinage the procurators showed regard for the sensibilities of the Jews.

FASCHER (1378) raises the question whether, if Josephus, and even more Philo (*Legatio ad Gaium* 302), have correctly painted Pilate in black colors, the Emperor Tiberius would have left him in office for ten years. We may reply that perhaps the reason he was allowed to remain in office was that from a Roman point of view he was efficient.

BRANDON (1379), in a popular survey, says that Josephus' account of Pilate's use of money from the Temple treasury to finance the building of an aqueduct in Jerusalem (Ant. 18. 60–62; War 2. 175–177) is tendentious but offers no proof. We may call attention to the fact that the Mishnah (Shekalim 4. 2) specifically states that all the needs of the city of Jerusalem, presumably including the water supply, were supplied from this money; but, as with the Jewish objection to the introduction of aniconic shields, this may reflect an earlier stage of Halakhah, which was liberalized by the time of the redaction of the Mishnah at the beginning of the third century. BRANDON asks why Josephus chooses to select three events from Pilate's ten-year administration and plausibly suggests that the answer is to be found in the complex apologetic notions that underlie his account.

BRANDON (1380) presents a lively, popular lecture.

GAROFALO (1381) presents a popular, general survey.

GIRARD (1382), pp. 45–49, comments on the chronology of the rule of Tiberius and of Pilate; his conclusion that Jesus died in 33 is unconvincing.

SMALLWOOD (1383) fully discusses the difficulty in Antiquities 18. 89–90, where we see that Pilate served for ten years, presumably until the spring of 36, yet did not arrive in Rome until a year later. She concludes that the figure of ten years is a round number and that Pilate did not leave Judaea until sometime between December, 36, and February, 37.

CAILLOIS (1384) presents a popular, romanticized account.

WINTER (1385), pp. 53–55 and 175–177, argues that Philo is our most trustworthy source for the procuratorship of Pilate, since he was contemporary and impartial; but we may contend that Philo in Alexandria is clearly writing at second-hand about events in Judaea in a work (*'Legatio ad Gaium'*) that is obviously apologetic; moreover, the fact that Pilate served for ten years – considerably longer than all but one of the other procurators (even if it was Tiberius' policy not to replace provincial administrators so far as possible) – would indicate that he was efficient and generally aware of the population's sensibilities. WINTER asserts that Josephus' report of Pilate's cruel behavior toward the Samaritans, whom Josephus, like other Jews, despised, shows that he can be trusted for his other statements about Pilate, and that the New Testament (Luke 13. 1–2) supports the portraits of Pilate in Philo and Josephus; but, we may comment, the fact that Pilate was cruel to the Samaritans may indicate only that Pilate was impartial in his attitude toward those who, in his view, disturbed the peace.

SANDMEL (1386) notes that Philo, Josephus, and the early Christian literature (though he exaggerates the similarity between the portrait in the New Testament and that in Philo and Josephus) are in accord in painting a black picture of Pilate, but that later literature progressively assesses him more favorably. He notes, however, that the Gospels take a positive step toward the tendency of the later apocryphal writing to create a historic kernel with a thick layer of legend.

EYBERS (1387) argues that the Gospels corroborate the portrait of Pilate that emerges from Philo and Josephus and concludes that he was no better or



worse than the other procurators; if this is so, we may comment, it is because the general level of performance of the procurators was rather low.

MAIER (1388) presents what he himself correctly terms a documented historical novel.

MAIER (1389) tries to defend Pilate for making the best of very difficult administrative situations. He suggests that in the affair of the aqueduct he had co-operation from Jewish priests, since for Gentiles to enter the Temple would surely have elicited an embassy to the Emperor Tiberius; but we may suggest that Pilate must have had his Jewish henchmen for such purposes. From the silence of Philo and Josephus about Pilate's fate he argues that Pilate became merely a pensioned ex-magistrate rather than a suicide as in Eusebius; this, we may add, is likely, since Josephus especially endeavors to prove moral lessons through his history, namely that those who conform to the will of G-d prosper beyond belief and that those who do not suffer (Ant. 1. 14).

SORDI (1389a) discusses the forcible interventions of Roman power in Judaea in 34 and 63 and the relations with the Christian community in Jerusalem. In particular, she discusses the suppression of the Samaritan tumult by Pilate (Ant. 18. 85ff.).

PEDDINGHAUS (1389b), pp. 48–65, discusses Josephus' evidence with regard to the competence of the procurator and of the Sanhedrin.

TURNER (1389c) discusses the portrait of Pilate in Josephus (Ant. 18. 55ff.). He asserts that the incidents recorded concerning Pilate in Josephus and in Philo indicate that Pilate lacked concern for Jewish sensibilities, but that they do not confirm the existence of a deliberate policy of provocation pursued on instructions from Rome. Rather, Pilate committed a series of personal blunders and proved to be a tactless administrator.

KOCH (1389d) has a popular account in which he hesitates to take a stand in judging Pilate as an administrator.

WANSBROUGH (1389e) contends that Pilate acted with the greatest possible leniency compatible with maintaining public order. This, he says, is clear from the fact that he served as procurator for ten years. We may, however, respond that Josephus himself states that it was Tiberius' deliberate policy not to replace administrators lest the new ones sap the economic strength of the country.

MAIER (1389f) arrives at the date of Jesus' crucifixion by Pilate as 3 April 33.

GRANT (1389g) stresses that the Jewish authorities at the time of Pilate could not inflict the death penalty. This point is clearly expressed by Josephus when he describes the beginning of direct Roman rule in Judaea and declares (War 2. 117) that Coponius' power was supreme.

COHN (1389h), in a popular account, argues, following Josephus and Tacitus, that it was Pilate who took the initiative in trying Jesus, that the Jews' role was to try to restrain Jesus, and that only the Gospels speak of a preliminary appearance before a Jewish court of justice.

SPEIDEL (1389i), pp. 87–93, in a popular, lavishly illustrated presentation, quotes liberally from Josephus in his portrayal of Pilate and highlights the new inscription of Pilate.

### 15.9: The Episode of Pilate's Introduction of the Emperor's Standards into Jerusalem

- (1390) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Incident of the Emperor's Standards (Ant. xviii. 55–59). Appendix I. In: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. Pp. 569–570.
- (1391) A. D. DOYLE: Pilate's Career and the Date of the Crucifixion. In: Journal of Theological Studies 42, 1941, pp. 190–193.
- (1392) FRÁNÓS H. COLSON, trans. and ed.: Philo, Vol. 10 (Loeb Classical Library). London 1962.
- (1393) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD, ed.: Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaum. Leiden 1961.
- (1394) PAUL L. MAIER: The Episode of the Golden Roman Shields at Jerusalem. In: Harvard Theological Review 62, 1969, pp. 109–121.
- (1395) CARL H. KRAELING: The Episode of the Roman Standards at Jerusalem. In: Harvard Theological Review 35, 1942, pp. 263–289.
- (1396) JOSEF BLINZLER: Die Niedermetzlung von Galiläern durch Pilatus. In: Novum Testamentum 2, 1957–58, pp. 24–49.
- (1397) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: Jews and Romans in the Early Empire. In: History Today 15, 1965, pp. 232–239, 313–319.
- (1398) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity. London 1951.
- (1398a) KARL-H. BERNHARDT: G-tt und Bild, Ein Beitrag zur Begründung und Deutung des Bildverbotes im Alten Testament. Diss. Greifswald 1952. Published: Berlin 1956.
- (1398b) DAVID FLUSSER: A Literary Approach to the Trial of Jesus. Judaism 20, 1971, pp. 32–36.

I (1390) have a select bibliography on this incident.

DOYLE (1391) notes the differences between Philo's account of the shields and Josephus' account of the standards introduced into Jerusalem, notably that the affair of the standards comes at the beginning of Pilate's rule, whereas Philo's account presupposes several years of previous misrule, that the standards bore images, while the shields, Philo specifically says (*Legatio ad Gaum* 299), did not, and that in Josephus the people appeal successfully to Pilate at Caesarea, whereas in Philo the appeal to Pilate, apparently in Jerusalem, is unsuccessful, and only a letter to the Emperor Tiberius is successful.

The attempt of COLSON (1392) to show that Philo and Josephus refer to the same episode because Eusebius (*Demonstratio Evangelica* 8, p. 403) identifies them is hardly convincing, since Eusebius' account has several inaccuracies, as SMALLWOOD (1393), p. 302, has noticed, and, in any case, we may add, Eusebius has failed to note, let alone to explain, the discrepancies between the accounts remarked above.

MAIER (1394) rightly insists that the episodes in Philo and Josephus are distinct. He says that there was no theological justification for the Jerusalemites' objections to the aniconic shields being brought in, and hence Josephus omits it; but, we may object, we know of no foundation for the statement, in War 2. 170, that there was a Jewish law which prohibited an image from being erected in Jerusalem. MAIER says that the objection mentioned by Philo was raised by ultra-Orthodox fanatics against an unpoular foreign governor; but, we may

reply, Philo (Legatio ad Gaium 303) says that it was the Jewish officials who objected.

KRAELING (1395), in a discussion of War 2. 169–174 and Antiquities 18. 55–59, suggests that the real objection of the Jews was to the introduction of iconic images into the Antonia, which was connected with the Temple and where the worship of the Emperor's image would have compromised the sanctity of the priestly garments which were stored there. But, we may comment, there is no indication in Josephus' account that the images were brought into the Antonia, though admittedly the Antonia, as a fortress, was in an excellent position for military control of the city; there is, moreover, no basis for KRAELING's conjecture (p. 281) that the Jews demanded the removal not only of the iconic but also of the aniconic objects. KRAELING further suggests that the Jews' objection may have been to the religious significance of the standards of the Roman army, which were regarded as *numina* and kept in special shrines. We may suggest that Pilate may have been led by his Jewish advisors to believe that there would be no outcry because he was aware of the law as later codified which saw no objection to such standards; what he did not expect was that the masses would take a stricter view of the law.

BLINZLER (1396) sees no relationship between the episode of the standards and Luke 13. 1, since it does not fit chronologically.

SMALLWOOD (1397) stresses that we have only the Jewish side of the story of Pilate's alleged provocation, and that one wishes that we could have Pilate's version as well; but, we may reflect, Josephus is often more pro-Roman than he is pro-Jewish.

BRANDON (1398) comments that whereas Josephus represents the affair of the images as due to Pilate's malicious intent toward the Jews, more likely he was acting under orders from Rome; but, in general, we may comment, Tiberius was an excellent administrator who was careful not to antagonize his subjects' sensibilities without cause (see Philo, Legatio ad Gaium, 301); and even if he desired a military presence in Jerusalem, nothing would be gained from that point of view by having images of the emperor introduced.

BERNHARDT (1398a), p. 13, briefly and uncritically discusses the affair of the standards (War 2. 169–174; Ant. 18. 55–59).

FLUSSER (1398b), pp. 35–36, concludes that Pilate's treatment of Jesus and of Barabbas fits the behavior of Pilate, as seen in War 2. 169–177 and Antiquities 18. 55–59 and 60–62, in that it embraces the same typical mixture of cruelty and weakness which made him finally abandon his original projects.

### 15.10: Pilate: the New Inscription

- (1399) DAVID MAGIE: De romanorum iuris publici sacrique vocabulis sollemnibus in Graecum sermonem conversis. Diss., Halle 1904. Published: Leipzig 1905.
- (1400) THEODOR MOMMSEN: Judaea und die Juden. In his: Römische Geschichte, vol. 5. Berlin 1885. Pp. 487–552.
- (1401) ANTONIO FROVA: Caesarea Maritima (Israele). Rapporto preliminare dell'I<sup>a</sup> campagna di scavo della Missione Archeologica Italiana. Milano 1959.

- (1402) ANTONIO FROVA: L'Iscrizione di Ponzio Pilato a Cesarea. In: Rendiconti Istituto Lombardo (Accademia di Scienze e Lettere) 95, 1961, pp. 419–434.
- (1403) SEBASTIAN BARTINA: Poncio Pilato en una inscripción monumentalista palestinese. In: Cultura Biblica 19, 1962, pp. 170–175.
- (1404) E. JERRY VARDAMAN: A New Inscription Which Mentions Pilate as 'Prefect'. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 81, 1962, pp. 70–71.
- (1405) BARUCH LIFSHITZ: Inscriptions latines de Césarée (Caesarea Palaestinae). In: Latomus 22, 1963, pp. 783–784.
- (1406) ATTILIO DE GRASSI: Sull' iscrizione di Ponzio Pilato. Rendiconti Memorie Notizie degli Scavi Necrologie Adunanze Solenni. Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei Roma. Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e filologiche 19, 1964, pp. 59–65.
- (1407) CARL B. GERRA: Le Iscrizioni. In: ANTONIO FROVA, ed., Scavi di Caesarea Maritima. Roma 1966. Pp. 217–228.
- (1408) ARISTIDE CALDERINI: Die Inschrift 'Pontius Pilatus' in Cäsarea. In: Das Heilige Land 96, 1964, pp. 56–58.
- (1409) L. A. YELNITSKY: Kesarijskaja nadpis' Pontija Pilata i ee istoričeskoe značenie (= The Caesarea Inscription of Pontius Pilate and Its Historical Significance). In: Vestnik Drevnej Istorii 93, 1965, pp. 142–146.
- (1410) JOSEF MICHELFELT: Das 'Christenkapitel' des Tacitus. In: Gymnasium 73, 1966, pp. 514–540.
- (1411) ERICH KOESTERMANN: Ein folgenschwerer Irrtum des Tacitus (Ann. 15, 44, 2ff.)? In: Historia 16, 1967, pp. 456–469.
- (1412) ETHELBERG STAUFFER: Die Pilatusinschrift von Caesarea (Erlanger Universitätsreden, N.F. 12). Erlangen 1966.
- (1413) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: Pontius Pilate in History and Legend. In: History Today 18, 1968, pp. 523–530. Rpt. in his: Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men, and Events. New York 1969. Pp. 254–267.
- (1414) HANS VOLKMANN: Die Pilatusinschrift von Caesarea Maritima. In: Gymnasium 75, 1968, pp. 124–135.
- (1415) EKKEHARD WEBER: Zur Inschrift des Pontius Pilatus. In: Bonner Jahrbücher 171, 1971, pp. 194–200.

MAGIE (1399) had already commented on the confused terminology in Josephus with regard to the procurators and notes that a procurator is variously termed ἱπάρχης, ἑπαρχος, ἐπιμελητής, ἐπίτροπος, and ἡγεμών. He says, but with some diffidence, that ἐπίτροπος = ἡγεμών and that *praefectus* = *procurator*. The title ἐπίτροπος which Josephus (War 2. 169) gives to Pilate definitely is the equivalent of procurator.

A new inscription on a two-by-three-foot stone discovered in 1961 in Caesarea establishes that Pilate's official title was *praefectus* rather than *procurator* (the title given him by Tacitus, Annals 15. 44. 3), thus confirming the view of MOMMSEN (1400) that Pilate was not a procurator but a prefect. FROVA (1401) (1402), who presents a magnificent *editio princeps* of this inscription, notes that the stone has ECTUS, which can be restored only as *praefectus*. He concludes that a governor of Judaea was called *praefectus* during the reigns of Augustus and Tiberius, that Claudius changed the title to *procurator*, and that Tacitus and Josephus (whose ἐπίτροπος in War 2. 169 for Pilate definitely equals *procurator*) are guilty of an anachronism. The New Testament, he notes, very accurately refrains from calling Pilate procurator but instead terms him governor (ἡγεμών), whereas Josephus is looser in his terminology. BARTINA (1403) concurs with this appraisal.

VARDAMAN (1404) dates the inscription from the earliest years of Pilate's administration, before the change in title to procurator was made; but, we may add, there is no evidence as to whether the change was made during Pilate's administration or thereafter. He says that the fact that Pilate apparently built a temple at Caesarea which promoted some form of veneration of the Emperor Tiberius fits the picture of Pilate found in Philo and Josephus and the coins as one who disregarded the sensibilities of the Jews. But we may comment that Caesarea itself was hardly a Jewish city, that before Herod's time it had no Jews at all (Ant. 20. 173), that Herod, who was generally conscious of Jewish sensibilities in the matter of images, erected statues and temples there (War 2. 266), and that as late as 59–60 it was sharply divided between Jews and Syrians, who quarreled on the subject of equal civic rights (War 2. 266–270, Ant. 20. 173–178).

LIFSHITZ (1405) ingeniously suggests that *praefectus* is Pilate's title in the inscription but is in apposition to the title *procurator*, which he restores; but the restoration, as DE GRASSI (1406) shows, is too free, since it involves inserting the words *proc(urator) Aug(usti)*, whereas the stone has only *(prae)fectus*.

GERRA (1407) similarly objects to LIFSHITZ's reconstruction on the ground that there is insufficient space for the letters which he claims were lost.

CALDERINI (1408) presents a brief report on the inscription without commenting on the significance of the term *praefectus*.

YELNITSKY (1409), as a result of this inscription, presents the hypothesis that Tacitus' Annals 15. 44. 3, where Pilate is termed *procurator*, is a Christian interpolation. But we may ask what a Christian would gain by calling Pilate procurator rather than prefect; on the contrary, we may suggest, if a Christian were to change the text of Tacitus, we would expect him to bring it into line with the New Testament, which terms Pilate ἡγεμὼν, "governor", rather than procurator. MICHELFEIT (1410), p. 518, and KOESTERMANN (1411), p. 463, refute YELNITSKY (1409) and convincingly argue for the authenticity of Tacitus' text.

STAUFFER (1412) finds it difficult to believe that Tacitus was guilty of an anachronism, assumes that he had good grounds for calling him a procurator, and predicts that some day Tacitus may be proven right. It is true, we may add, that Tacitus himself had been a public official and certainly knew much about civil service in the Roman Empire, but the matter of terminology was both complex and fluid, as we see from Josephus; and since Tacitus lived almost a century after Pilate he might well have erred in the matter of terminology.

BRANDON (1413), in his popular survey, correctly notes that there is no significant difference in status between a procurator and a prefect.

VOLKMANN (1414), in a general survey, notes that whereas in the 'War' Pilate is called ἐπίτροπος (procurator), in the 'Antiquities' he is termed ἡγεμὼν, which has many meanings. Philo similarly calls Pilate both ἐπίτροπος and ἑπαρχός. Fadus, a later procurator, is termed by Josephus both ἑπαρχός and ἐπίτροπος. He concludes that Tacitus is guilty of an anachronism; but we may suggest that the fluidity in terminology indicates either that Pilate's title changed

in the course of his administration of Judaea or that the titles are not as rigid as modern scholars believe.

WEBER (1415), commenting on the discrepancy between the inscription and Tacitus, says that Josephus' description of Pilate as a procurator is not necessarily a late Christian interpolation but reflects his inexactitude when it comes to the technical terms about ruling.

### 15.11: The Procurators after Pilate

- (1416) SIEGFRIED J. DE LAET: Le successeur de Ponce-Pilate. In: *L'Antiquité Classique* 8, 1939, pp. 413–419.
- (1417) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: The Date of the Dismissal of Pontius Pilate from Judaea. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5, 1954, pp. 12–21.
- (1418) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.–A.D. 135). Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMER and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973.
- (1419) E. STEIN: Marullus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 14. 2, 1930, col. 2053.
- (1420) ARNOLD H. M. JONES: Procurators and Prefects in the Early Principate. In his: *Studies in Roman Government and Law*. Oxford 1960. Pp. 115–125.
- (1421) ALEXANDER FUKS: Notes on the Archive of Nicanor. In: *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 5, 1951, pp. 207–216.
- (1422) JACQUES SCHWARTZ: Note sur la famille de Philon d'Alexandrie. In: *Université Libre de Bruxelles: Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et l'Histoire Orientales et Slaves* (Bruxelles) 13, 1953 (*Mélanges Isidore Lévy*), pp. 591–602.
- (1423) ERIC G. TURNER: Tiberius Iulius Alexander. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 44, 1954, pp. 54–64.
- (1424) VIKTOR BURR: *Tiberius Iulius Alexander*. Bonn 1955.
- (1425) JOHN GRAY: *A History of Jerusalem*. New York 1969.
- (1426) MOSES ABERBACH: The Conflicting Accounts of Josephus and Tacitus Concerning Cumanus' and Felix' Terms of Office. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 40, 1949–50, pp. 1–14.
- (1427) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: Some Comments on Tacitus, *Annals* XII, 54. In: *Latomus* 18, 1959, pp. 560–567.
- (1428) CHARLES SAUMAGNE: Saint Paul et Félix, procureur de Judée. In: RAYMOND CHEVALLIER, ed., *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à André Piganiol*. Vol. 3. Paris 1966. Pp. 1373–1386.
- (1429) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: Behind the New Testament. In: *Greece and Rome* 17, 1970, pp. 81–99.
- (1429a) JOCHEN BLEICKEN: *Senatsgericht und Kaisergericht; eine Studie zur Entwicklung des Prozessrechtes im frühen Prinzipat* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3. Folge, Nr. 53). Göttingen 1962.
- (1429b) GEORGE OGG: *The Chronology of the Life of Paul*. London 1968.
- (1429c) MENAHEM STERN: The Status of Provincia Judaea and Its Governors in the Roman Empire under the Julio-Claudian Dynasty (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 10, 1971, pp. 274–282.
- (1429d) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: The Full Name of the Procurator Felix. In: *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 1, 1978, pp. 33–36.

DE LAET (1416) emends Μαρκέλλον to Μαρούλλον and ἱπάρχην to ἑπαρχον in *Antiquities* 18. 89, since Marcellus is otherwise unknown and Marullus

is mentioned in Antiquities 18. 237 as having been dispatched as cavalry commander (ἱπάρχης). He thus concludes that Caligula named as procurator in Judaea one who had been provisionally appointed by Vitellius, the governor of Syria, and who had for several months been fulfilling this function without carrying the title. This suggestion is adopted by SMALLWOOD (1417) and the revised SCHÜRER (1418), p. 383; but we must object that the suggestion goes counter to the unanimous testimony of the manuscripts and of the Latin version, that it is generally Josephus' way when mentioning someone who has been previously cited to indicate a cross-reference, that the use of ἐκπέμπει in Antiquities 18. 237 indicates that Caligula had sent Marullus from Rome, and that the title ἱπάρχης may mean no more than "commander of cavalry" and may not indicate that Marullus was procurator at all.

STEIN (1419) follows HUDSON in emending ἱπάρχην in Antiquities 18. 237 to ἑπαρχον, "procurator". Similarly JONES (1420), p. 195, suggests that the title ἱπάρχης given to Marullus (Ant. 18. 237) is an error for ὑπάρχον or ἑπαρχον; but inasmuch as there is no indication that the procurator Marcellus had been removed, such an emendation seems otiose. He concludes that the term ἑπαρχος, "prefect", reproduces his source more accurately, though it would have been strange to his readers, since the later term for administrator was ἐπίτροπος, "procurator". But, we may comment, the terminology was not precise, as we see from the fact that Fadus, the administrator after Marcellus, is termed by Josephus alternately prefect and procurator.

FUKS (1421) notes that one of the businessmen served by Nicanor's transport may be identified with some probability with Tiberius Julius Alexander, who was later to become procurator of Judaea.

SCHWARTZ (1422) inconclusively conjectures that the date of birth of Tiberius Julius Alexander was posterior to the first years of the Emperor Tiberius. His basis is that Tiberius Julius Alexander was the son of Alexander the Alabarch.

TURNER (1423), in his evaluation of Tiberius Julius Alexander, notes that whereas in the 'War' there is nothing derogatory about Alexander, in the 'Antiquities' there appears the remark that Alexander did not adhere to his ancestral Jewish religion (Ant. 20. 100). TURNER, citing inscriptions and papyri, concludes that Alexander was an able, often likable, dependable, and loyal civil servant, who also took his tone from his environment. He suggests that the difference in nuance between the 'War' and the 'Antiquities' with regard to Alexander is due to the fact that Josephus looked upon him as a possible patron while he was writing the 'War', but that when he wrote the 'Antiquities' either Alexander was dead or politically had no influence. This, we may remark, is mere conjecture. In general, we may comment, Josephus is more 'pro-Jewish' in the 'Antiquities' than in the 'War'; but there is no evidence with regard to Alexander after the Jewish War.

BURR (1424) presents a full-length biography of Alexander but gives little attention to his procuratorship.

In discussing the events leading up to the Jewish revolt, GRAY (1425), p. 177, states that the strict impartiality of Roman justice and consideration for

the religious sensibilities of the Jews are evident in the execution by Cumanus, Alexander's successor, of the soldier who had torn up a Torah scroll. But, we may comment, Josephus' explanation (Ant. 20. 117) is much more convincing, namely, that Cumanus did so because of his alarm at the thought of a fresh revolution of the Jews.

Tacitus, *Annals* 12. 54, speaks of Palestine as being ruled by Cumanus, who was in charge of Galilee, and Felix, who was in charge of Samaria (and presumably of Judaea); whereas Josephus (Ant. 20. 137) reports that Felix succeeded Cumanus. ABERBACH (1426) ingeniously attempts to reconcile the accounts by suggesting that Cumanus was in charge of Judaea and Samaria, whereas Felix ruled Galilee, in which Josephus was less interested at this time. But, we may comment, it seems hard to believe that if Felix was already serving in Palestine, Josephus should not have mentioned this fact but should say that Claudius "sent" (ἐκπέμπει, War 2. 247; πέμπει, Ant. 20. 137) him to take charge of Judaea. We should note, however, that Josephus, who normally speaks of a person as being sent to be procurator of Judaea (as indeed he does for Felix in *Antiquities* 20. 137), says (War 2. 247) that Felix was sent to be procurator of Judaea, Samaria, Galilee, and Peraea; this, we may suggest, would not necessarily be inconsistent with his having served as procurator of one of these districts previously.

SMALLWOOD (1427), commenting on the discrepancy between Tacitus and Josephus with regard to Cumanus and Felix, prefers Josephus' fuller account to that of Tacitus, noting that Tacitus elsewhere (*Annals* 12. 23) also is confused about Judaea in postponing the recording of Agrippa's death until five years after it had occurred and in stating that after Agrippa's death Judaea was annexed to the province of Syria. She says that Tacitus cannot be correct in stating that Felix was both the procurator of a neighboring district and a member of the tribunal which tried Cumanus; but it is clear, we may comment, that Tacitus, who makes no special comment about it, did not regard this as extraordinary. She speculates, though without evidence, that Felix was appointed acting governor until a successor could be chosen to Cumanus, and that hence both Fadus and Cumanus were for a short time governing Judaea.

SAUMAGNE (1428), on the other hand, prefers the account of Tacitus to that of Josephus, noting that Josephus' accounts of Felix vary; but, we must retort, it seems hard to believe that Josephus, who was fifteen when Felix became procurator, should have been misinformed about so important a figure in the history of the background of the revolt against Rome.

SMALLWOOD (1429) suggests that the absence of complaints about Festus, Felix's successor, indicates that he was efficient and did not offend Jewish sensibilities; we may suggest that he may have found favor in Josephus' eyes because he put down so effectively (War 2. 271, Ant. 20. 185–188) the Sicarii, the revolutionaries whom Josephus so despised.

BLEICKEN (1429a), p. 181, concludes, on the basis of Josephus (War 2. 117, Ant. 18. 2) that the procurators Felix and Festus, in contrast to their predecessors, did not have the right to put people to death, whereas previous procurators had been granted that right.



OGG (1429b), pp. 51–55, discussing the famine (Ant. 20. 101) that occurred during the procuratorship of Tiberius Julius Alexander, favors the reading ἐπὶ τούτου (ibid.), “in his (administration)”, that is, of Tiberius Alexander, as fitting the context and making sense. OGG, pp. 155–159, concludes, on the basis of Josephus (Ant. 20. 182), that the date of the beginning of Festus’ procuratorship was 55 C.E.

STERN (1429c), on the basis of the inscription recently discovered at Caesarea, asserts that the official title of governors before the time of Claudius was *praefectus*, and that under Claudius it became *procurator*. The governors at first were of Italian origin, but later they came from the Near East. STERN stresses the importance of the fact that the governors were of equestrian rank and that those living in Judaea could appeal to these governors if they had complaints against procurators, and that they could even prosecute the procurators in Rome after their term of service had been completed.

BRUCE (1429d), noting the discrepancy between Josephus (Ant. 20. 137), who says that the *nomen gentile* of the procurator Felix was Claudius, and Tacitus (Histories 5. 9), who says that it was Antonius, cites a Greek epitaph of Bir el-malik which mentions a procurator whose praenomen and nomen were Tiberius Claudius and concludes that his *nomen gentile* was probably Claudius. We may note that the reading of the Epitome of Josephus (Ant. 20. 137) is Κλαύδιος Φήλικα, that is, that “Claudius [sent] Felix”; moreover, the name Antonius Felix is supported by an inscription (C.I.L. 5. 34).

## 15.12: Agrippa I

- (1430) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on Agrippa I (Ant. xviii. 143ff.). Appendix N. In: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. Pp. 578–579.
- (1431) WOLF WIRGIN: Herod Agrippa 1. King of the Jews. Part 1: Agrippa 1 in History and Historiography. In: Leeds University Oriental Society Monographs, Series 10 (A) and 10 (B). Leeds 1968.
- (1432) PLINIO FRACCARO: C. Herennius Capito di Teate procurator di Livia, di Tiberio e di Gaio. In: Athenaeum 18, 1940, pp. 136–144.
- (1433) ERNST BAMMEL: Der Achtundzwanzigste Adar. In: Hebrew Union College Annual 28, 1957, pp. 109–113.
- (1434) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Did Agrippa Write a Letter to Gaius Caligula? In: Jewish Quarterly Review 56, 1965–66, pp. 22–31.
- (1435) ADOLF REIFENBERG: A Memorial Coin of Herod Agrippa I (in Hebrew). In: Yedi’ot ha-ḥevrah ha-’ivrit le-ḥakirat Erez-Yisrael ve-’atikoteha (= Bulletin of the Jewish Palestine Exploration Society) 5, 1937–38, pp. 117–118.
- (1436) JEAN LAUFFERAY: Forums et monuments de Béryte. In: Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth 7, 1944–45, pp. 13–80.
- (1437) JULIAN MORGENSTERN: The Chanukah Festival and the Calendar of Ancient Israel. In: Hebrew Union College Annual 20, 1947, pp. 1–136.
- (1438) JULIAN MORGENSTERN: The King-god among the Western Semites and the Meaning of Epiphanes. In: Vetus Testamentum 10, 1960, pp. 138–197.
- (1439) JULIAN MORGENSTERN: The Fire under the Altar. Chicago 1963.

- (1440) ALEXANDER FUKS (FUCHS): Marcus Julius Alexander (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 13–14, 1948–49, pp. 10–17.
- (1441) ALEXANDER FUKS: Notes on the Archive of Nicanor. In: *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 5, 1951, pp. 207–216.
- (1442) JACQUES SCHWARTZ: Note sur la famille de Philon d'Alexandrie. In: *Université Libre de Bruxelles: Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et l'Histoire Orientales et Slaves (Brüssel)* 13, 1953 (*Mélanges Isidore Lévy*), pp. 591–602.
- (1443) JOSEF MEYSHAN (MESTSCHANSKI): The Coinage of Agrippa the First. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 4, 1954, pp. 186–200.
- (1444) HARALD RIESENFELD: Jésus Transfiguré: L'Arrière-plan du récit évangélique de la Transfiguration du Nôtre-Seigneur. Diss., Uppsala 1947. In: *Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, 16. Copenhagen 1947.
- (1444a) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, trans. and ed.: *Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 31: In Flaccum. Paris 1967.
- (1444b) WOLF WIRGIN: Herod Agrippa 1. King of the Jews (Leeds University Oriental Society, Monograph Series, 10A). Leeds 1968 (typewritten).
- (1444c) MENAHEM STERN: The Kingdom of Agrippa the First (in Hebrew). In: *Joseph Amoraï Memorial Volume*. Tel-Aviv 1973.
- (1444d) EPHRAIM URBACH: Jewish Doctrines and Practices in the Hellenistic and Talmudic Periods. In: SALO W. BARON and GEORGE S. WISE, edd., *Violence and Defense in the Jewish Experience*. Philadelphia 1977. Pp. 71–85.

I (1430) have a select bibliography on Agrippa I.

WIRGIN (1431), pp. 11–16, concludes that Josephus applied the same expedient of concealing facts of which he accused Nicolaus of Damascus.

FRACCARO (1432) plausibly identifies the Herennius Capito mentioned by Josephus (*Ant.* 18. 158), who is procurator of Jamnia and who demanded repayment of a huge amount which Agrippa I owed to the Imperial treasury at Rome, with C. Herennius Capito, who in an inscription of Chieti is called procurator of Julius Agrippa, of Tiberius, and of Gaius.

BAMMEL (1433) identifies the twenty-eighth of Adar in 'Megillath Ta'anith', on the basis of Ta'anith 18a and Rosh Hashanah 19a, as the day in the year 31 in which Antonia, the sister-in-law of Tiberius, having been asked by her friend Berenice the mother of Agrippa to intervene, managed to get Tiberius to stop the persecution of the Jews by Sejanus. But, we may comment, the Talmudic passages refer to permission granted the Jews to study Torah, whereas Antonia's intervention, as recorded in Josephus, is to persuade Tiberius to hear the charge against Agrippa (which ultimately leads to his imprisonment).

ZEITLIN (1434) accepts neither the account in Philo (*Legatio ad Gaium* 276–333), according to which Agrippa wrote a letter to Caligula, nor that in Josephus (*Ant.* 18. 289ff.), according to which he invited Caligula to a banquet at which he intervened on behalf of the Jews of Palestine. The letter, to be sure, contains some irregularities of style, but such liberty is in accordance with historiographic tradition. The banquet appears melodramatic and seems much like the tactics of Queen Esther in the Bible; but Josephus' account of Agrippa is unusually full, and since he has no particular reason to be unduly partial (and indeed records some negative points about Agrippa, such as his extravagance [*Ant.* 18. 145] and his planned suicide [*Ant.* 18. 147]), we may state that it merits credibility.

REIFENBERG (1435) describes a coin depicting Agrippa naked, as was customary with prisoners, being crowned in the presence of the Emperor, in close accordance with *Antiquities* 19. 294. It is not unlikely, says REIFENBERG, that the object hanging down from the pediment is the golden chain which Caligula presented to him according to Josephus (*Ant.* 18. 237, 19. 294).

LAUFFRAY (1436), pp. 35–57, reporting on the remains of a large civic basilica dedicated by Agrippa I and Berenice in Beirut, where, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 19. 335), Agrippa erected many buildings, notes that the inscription apparently associated with the building has a key word missing, so that it is not clear whether it is a temple, forum, or bath; LAUFFRAY thinks it is a forum, since the site borders on a forum.

MORGENSTERN (1437), pp. 90–91, commenting on Josephus' description of the spectacles introduced by Agrippa, who was subsequently saluted as a god at one of them (*Ant.* 19. 345), presents the extravagant suggestion that Agrippa was playing the role of a sun-god and that the festival was actually an equinoctial or solstitial New Year's Day celebration. MORGENSTERN (1438) repeats his suggestion in another article. If Agrippa had lived, he says, he would have been known in history as Agrippa Epiphanes ('the manifest god'). But MORGENSTERN's mistake is that he cannot imagine a king's presence at games merely as a spectator. Elsewhere MORGENSTERN (1439) compares Agrippa's rule with that of King Uzziah in II Kings 15. 3–5 and presents the fantastic suggestion that the author of the Biblical account has suppressed most of the details preserved by Josephus; more likely, we may comment, the author of the account of Agrippa saw the parallel with the Biblical narrative.

FUKS (1440) argues that Marcus Julius Alexander, who is mentioned in five ostraca as an important businessman engaged in international trade, is the son of Alexander the Alabarch (*Ant.* 18. 159), from whom Agrippa I sought a huge loan.

FUKS (1441) notes that this Marcus Julius Alexander, mentioned in *Antiquities* 19. 277, who married Berenice, the daughter of Agrippa I, was one of Nicanor's most important customers and had significant business dealings with Arab countries and with India. He notes that the chronology of the ostraca regarding Marcus coincides with the data supplied by Josephus.

SCHWARTZ (1442) rejects the reading "Lysimachus" (*Ant.* 19. 276) as a gloss in connection with Alexander the Alabarch.

On the basis of the description of the manner of Agrippa's death in *Antiquities* 19. 346–350, MEYSHAN (1443), p. 187, suggests that he was poisoned by arsenic, the standard poison of the era.

RIESENFELD (1444) attempts to compare what the inhabitants of Caesarea and Sebaste did after the death of Agrippa on their roofs (*Ant.* 19. 356–359) with the construction of the booths on roofs for the Festival of Tabernacles by Jews in the days of Ezra (*Nehemiah* 8. 16); but the comparison is far-fetched, since there is no mention of huts in Josephus, and the celebration is so different from what is customary at Tabernacles.

PELLETIER (1444a), pp. 21–35, especially 25–30, discusses the personality of Agrippa I, with particular reference to the relationship of Josephus' and

Philo's accounts of him and of the chronology of events in Alexandria surrounding his visit and the aftermath.

WIRGIN (1444b) compares Josephus, Philo, and the Mishnah in their portraits of Agrippa I. The resulting portrayal is neither fully bright nor fully dark. On pages 11–16 he claims to have found proof that Josephus applied the same expedient of 'concealing' facts of which he accused Nicolaus of Damascus. He even goes so far, though unconvincingly, to claim that Josephus omitted the contents of the last three chapters of I Maccabees because Simon the Maccabee is presented there in such lasting glory that this portrayal would have eclipsed the Herodians and, in particular, the two Agrippas. Agrippa's reign, he says, was looked back upon as a golden age and conditioned the revolt against Rome. We may, however, comment that while it is true that the rabbis, or some of them, so regarded Agrippa, he was hardly looked up to by the revolutionaries, since, after all, he had been put into power by the Romans and indeed behaved, on the whole, as a lackey of Rome. [See *infra*, p. 928.]

STERN (1444c), following Josephus closely, in a general survey of Agrippa I, his family, and their wives, disagrees with the generally accepted view that Agrippa showed a pro-Pharisaic policy toward the high priests. We may remark that Agrippa may have acted thus not so much because he was pro-Pharisaic but because he was sufficiently realistic to perceive that the Pharisees were far more popular with the masses, as Josephus notes, than were the Sadducees.

URBACH (1444d), pp. 78–83, commenting on the story of Petronius and Agrippa's protest against the introduction of images into Jerusalem, suggests that Josephus, as a descendant of the Hasmoneans, exaggerates his praise of Agrippa, as he does his denigration of Herod, the great opponent of the Hasmoneans. Without mentioning it explicitly, Josephus, moreover, he says, provides a comparison between Agrippa and Alexander Jannaeus in his story of Agrippa's treatment of Simon, who had previously denounced him (*Ant.* 19. 332–334).

### 15.13: Gaius Caligula and Claudius

- (1445) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Emperor Gaius' Dealings with the Jews (*Ant.* xviii. 257ff.). Appendix O. In: Josephus, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. Pp. 580–581.
- (1446) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Sources of Book XIX. Appendix P. In: Josephus, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965, P. 582.
- (1447) JEAN GAGÉ: L'Empereur romaine et les rois: politique et protocole. In: *Revue Historique* 221, 1959, pp. 221–260.
- (1448) JOHN P. V. D. BALSDON: *The Emperor Gaius (Caligula)*. Oxford 1934.
- (1449) BIRGITTA TAMM: Ist der Castortempel das *vestibulum* zu dem Palast des Caligula gewesen? In: *Eranos* 62, 1964, pp. 146–169.
- (1450) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: The Chronology of Gaius' Attempt to Desecrate the Temple. In: *Latomus* 16, 1957, pp. 3–17.

- (1451) THEODOR MOMMSEN: Cornelius Tacitus und Cluvius Rufus. In: *Hermes* 4, 1870, pp. 295–325.
- (1452) EDMUND GROAG and ARTHUR STEIN: *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, Saec. I. II. III. 2nd ed., Berlin 1933–58. C 1202.
- (1453) ARNALDO D. MOMIGLIANO: Osservazioni sulle fonti per la storia di Caligola, Claudio, Nerone. In: *Rendiconti della Accademia dei Lincei* 8, 1932.
- (1454) RONALD SYME: *Tacitus*. Vol. 1. Oxford 1958.
- (1455) G. B. TOWNEND: The Sources of the Greek in Suetonius. In: *Hermes* 88, 1960, pp. 98–120.
- (1456) G. B. TOWNEND: Cluvius Rufus in the *Histories* of Tacitus. In: *American Journal of Philology* 85, 1964, pp. 337–377.
- (1457) TESSA RAJAK, reviser: Josephus. In: EMIL SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973. Pp. 43–63.
- (1458) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. New York 1950.
- (1459) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: The Sources of Josephus' *Antiquities*, Book 19. In: *Latomus* 21, 1962, pp. 320–333.
- (1460) DIETER TIMPE: Römische Geschichte bei Flavius Josephus. In: *Historia* 9, 1960, pp. 474–502.
- (1461) RONALD SYME: The Historian Servilius Nonianus. In: *Hermes* 92, 1964, pp. 408–424.
- (1462) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: *Josephus*, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965.
- (1463) MICHAEL SWAN: Josephus, A.J. XIX, 251–252: Opposition to Gaius and Claudius. In: *American Journal of Philology* 91, 1970, pp. 149–164.
- (1464) H. JUNG: Die Thronerhebung des Claudius. In: *Chiron* 2, 1972, pp. 367–386. (Mitteilungen der Kommission für alte Geschichte und Epigraphik des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts München).
- (1465) VINCENT M. SCRAMUZZA: *The Emperor Claudius*. Cambridge, Mass. 1940.
- (1466) FRIEDRICH SCHEMANN: *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der jüdischen Archäologie Buch XVIII–XX = Polemos II, cap. VII–XIV, 3. Diss., Marburg 1887. Published: Hagen 1887.*
- (1467) RUDOLF HANSLIK: Vatinius, no. 5. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 2. Reihe, 8, 1955, col. 520.
- (1468) HANS W. RITTER: Cluvius Rufus bei Josephus? Bemerkungen zu *Ios. ant.* 19, 91 f. In: *Rheinisches Museum* 115, 1972, pp. 85–91.
- (1469) DIETER TIMPE: *Untersuchungen zur Kontinuität des frühen Prinzipats*. Wiesbaden 1962.
- (1469a) STEPHEN BENKO: The Edict of Claudius of A.D. 49 and the Instigator Chrestus. In: *Theologische Zeitschrift* 25, 1969, pp. 406–418.
- (1469b) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, trans. and ed.: *Les Oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 32: *Legatio ad Caicum*. Paris 1972.
- (1469c) SAM WAGENAAR: L'ebreo che salvò l'Impero Romano. In: *Rassegna Mensile di Israel* 41, 1975, pp. 430–436.
- (1469d) PER BILDE: The Roman Emperor Gaius (Caligula)'s Attempt to Erect His Statue in the Temple of Jerusalem. In: *Studia Theologica* 32, 1978, pp. 67–93.
- (1469e) V. MASSARO and I. MONTGOMERY: Gaius – Mad, Bad, Ill, or All Three. In: *Latomus* 37, 1978, pp. 894–909.

I (1445)(1446) have select bibliographies on Caligula's dealings with the Jews (*Ant.* 18. 257ff.) and on the sources of 'Antiquities', Book 19, which contains Josephus' extremely detailed account of the assassination of Gaius Caligula and of the accession of Claudius.

GAGÉ (1447), pp. 236–242, cites Josephus against the view of BALSDON (1448) that Caligula did not perceptibly depart from the policy of Augustus and Tiberius; but Josephus' main point, we may say, is that Caligula did depart from earlier imperial policy.

TAMM (1449) argues that Josephus' account (Ant. 19. 71) of the statues confirms Suetonius' statement (Caligula 22).

SMALLWOOD (1450) understandably prefers Philo's dating (40 C.E.) to that of Josephus (Ant. 18. 261–310) for Petronius' mission to erect Caligula's statue in the Temple, since Philo was a contemporary of the events here described; but Josephus, we may comment, was a very knowledgeable priest, and it seems unlikely that he should not have known the chronological details of so celebrated an event.

In connection with the conspiracy to assassinate Caligula, Josephus (Ant. 19. 91–92) records a conversation between a certain Cluitus, a man of consular rank, and a senator named Bathybius, in which Cluitus gives an apt quotation from Homer urging Bathybius to be silent. Though, we may note, the manuscripts are unanimous in reading Κλούιτος and the Latin version reads Cluitus, HUDSON emended the name to Κλούβιος and NIESE to Κλούτιος. Such an anecdote, according to MOMMSEN (1451), can derive only from Cluvius Rufus himself, and not verbally but precisely from his writings. Even if we adopt the emendation and read *Cluvius*, it is far from certain, we may object, that this is Cluvius Rufus the historian. As a *novus homo* he would have had to be about forty before obtaining the consulship, and thus he would be an old man when, twenty-four years later, we find him singing on the stage with Nero (Suetonius, Nero 21. 2; cf. Dio Cassius 63. 14. 3). Hence GROAG (1452), the great master of prosopography, identifies Josephus' Cluvius with the father of Cluvius Rufus. Nonetheless, MOMMSEN's view has won general acceptance; MOMIGLIANO (1453), p. 305, argues that Cluvius was the main source not only of Josephus but also of Suetonius and of Dio Cassius, the other two chief extant sources on the subject of Caligula's assassination. The view is accepted by SYME (1454), p. 287, TOWNEND (1455), pp. 102–103 and (1456), and RAJAK (1457), p. 51, n. 17. TOWNEND (1455) argues that Cluvius' quotation of Homer can come only from someone who knew Homer well, and that is far more likely to be Cluvius himself rather than Josephus, who was not interested in the Greek classics nor likely to be capable of producing a nearly correct Homeric hexameter; but, we may reply, Josephus says (Ant. 20. 263) that he labored strenuously to partake of the realm of Greek prose and poetry; and he must have known Homer, the premier Greek poet, who was most popular in the Hellenistic Age, as we see from the number of fragments of his works found in papyri. The rabbis, too, knew his works, as we see from the fact that he is the one poet mentioned by name in rabbinic literature (Mishnah, Yadaim 4. 6); and LIEBERMAN (1458), pp. 113–114, has even cited a Homeric phrase in rabbinic literature. Moreover, Josephus mentions Homer in a number of places and even knows (Against Apion 2. 155) that Homer nowhere employs the word νόμος, implying that he had read his works *in toto* (though admittedly he may have known this from a secondary source).

I (1459) have cast doubt on MOMMSEN's thesis that Cluvius Rufus was Josephus' source and suggest several alternative written and oral sources. In particular, we may note, the fact that Agrippa's role in the accession of Claudius is built up to such a degree in Josephus can hardly be due to Cluvius; more likely, we may guess, it was derived from Josephus' friend Agrippa II, son of Agrippa I, who elsewhere (Life 366) declares himself ready to inform him of details that are not generally known.

TIMPE (1460) presents a painstaking analysis of Josephus' account of Caligula's assassination and Claudius' accession, and concludes that Josephus' source, which is clearly senatorial in its sympathies, is closer in outlook than is generally recognized to Tacitus' source for this period.

SYME (1461), p. 420, concludes that Josephus' style and sentiments in his account of the assassination of Caligula and its sequel reflect a Roman historian in whom can be recognized a predecessor of Tacitus. Though, he admits, the claimant most in favor has been Cluvius Rufus, SYME suggests that Servilius Nonianus or Aufidius Bassus may also have a claim.

The manuscripts in *Antiquities* 19. 251 read that Marcus Minucianus was a claimant to the throne after the assassination of Caligula; but in 19. 252 we read that Minucianus, who is identified as one of Caligula's assassins, restrained Valerius Asiaticus from such a design. I (1462) have adopted the reading Vinicius in the first passage because it seems unlikely that after first mentioning Minucianus or Vinicianus without comment Josephus would in his second reference to him a few lines later identify him as an assassin. This point of view is likewise upheld by SWAN (1463), who concludes that Vinicianus, far from being an ally of Vinicius, collaborated with the consuls instead of being a rival of theirs and that he did not seek the principate for himself.

I have been unable to consult JUNG (1464).

SCRAMUZZA (1465), pp. 11–18, concludes that when checked against other sources Josephus is again and again proved unreliable. But, we may remark, such a conclusion is largely based on the assumption that the other main sources for these events, Suetonius and Dio Cassius, are more dependable. SCRAMUZZA notes, moreover, the marked discrepancy between War 2. 204–233 and 'Antiquities', Book 19, in describing the circumstances under which Claudius was elevated to the throne, and disagrees with SCHEMANN (1466), who had contended that War 2. 204–214 and *Antiquities* 19. 1–273 show such verbal agreement as to postulate the use of a common source. SCRAMUZZA, pp. 54–60, finds incredible the detailed description in Book 19 of the 'Antiquities' of Claudius as a weakling dominated by Agrippa and conjectures that this is due to a new source, probably Cluvius Rufus, sympathetic to the Flavians, his patrons. But, we may comment, inasmuch as we have only very slight fragments of Cluvius' work, we have no way of knowing the tendency of his work. Such a slant would seem most likely due to Agrippa himself or to his son. SCRAMUZZA asserts that we can scarcely doubt that accounts of Caligula's death had been written by Jews in the Diaspora to illustrate how G-d had punished him for his impious deeds toward the Jews; but, we may reply, we not only do not have any such accounts, but we also do not know of any such.

Josephus (Ant. 19. 91) says that a certain Bathybius, a man of senatorial rank who had been praetor, engaged Cluitus in conversation with regard to the conspiracy against Caligula; but the name is otherwise unknown. HANSLIK (1467) suggests adopting HUDSON's emendation Vatinius; but, we may comment, this has little to recommend it, since we know of no one by this name of equestrian or senatorial rank during this period.

RITTER (1468) suggests that the name be emended to Talthybius, the name of Agamemnon's herald, that this would be an allusion to the decline of the role of the herald under Nero, and that hence Cluvius Rufus, who held the position of herald under Nero, must be rejected as Josephus' source. But, we may comment, the emendation is transcriptionally improbable, and since all the other names in Josephus' account seem to be real names of people there is no reason to suppose that his is a mere literary name.

TIMPE (1469), pp. 77–93, discussing Josephus' account of the assassination of Caligula and the accession of Claudius, concludes that Josephus is tendentious as a critic of the Senate and as a praiser of the virtues of Cassius Chaerea more than the latter historically deserves. It is not clear from Josephus that he is speaking of the accession of a *princeps*, inasmuch as *princeps* has no sharply defined equivalent in Greek.

BENKO (1469a) notes that Dio (60. 6. 6) obviously places the date of the edict forbidding Jews to hold meetings at the beginning of Claudius' reign, whereas Josephus (Ant. 19. 278ff.) asserts that Claudius then extended many privileges to the Jews. We may, however, comment that the passage in Dio is by no means explicit. As to BENKO's assumption that the disturbance in Rome under Chrestus was similar to those in the land of Israel under Theudas (Ant. 20. 97–98), Annibas (Ant. 20. 3–4), and Tholomaeus (Ant. 20. 5), we may reply that there is no evidence that the revolutionary movements had adherents in Rome; indeed, if they had, one would have expected some mention in Josephus of Jewish volunteers leaving Rome to fight in Judaea, as there were volunteers from Adiabene, for example.

PELLETIER (1469b) has an excursus, pp. 47–53, summarizing the personages involved in the embassy to Gaius on the basis of Philo and Josephus.

WAAGENAAR (1469c) has a brief discussion of the role of Agrippa I in the accession of Claudius.

BILDE (1469d), on the basis of War 2. 184–203, Antiquities 18. 261–309, Philo's Legatio ad Gaium 199–338, and Tacitus' Histories 5. 9, contends that the events in Palestine during the autumn of 40 constitute an important and well-witnessed link in a long series of clashes between the Jews and the foreign occupants of Palestine during this period. He analyzes the reason for Caligula's decision and the character of the project, Petronius' attitude, the Jewish opposition, Agrippa's intervention, the cancellation of the project, and the chronological question. He contends that it was only Agrippa's clever policy, combined with rather fortunate circumstances on the Roman side, that prevented the dispute from becoming a full-fledged revolution. He stresses the importance of careful and comprehensive analysis of tendency and literary form as part of historical criticism. BILDE admits that in principle this is not at all new, but says that in



the study of Philo and Josephus this type of analysis has not been widely applied. He concludes that Josephus is a better historian than was assumed during most of the last century, since he resisted more than our other witnesses the temptation to embed his description in overall theological schematizations. We may, however, object that perhaps Josephus showed favoritism in highlighting the role of Agrippa I, who is also the hero in Josephus' unusually long excursus on the assassination of Caligula and the accession of Claudius (Ant. 19. 1–273); we may note that Josephus' parallel account in the 'War' does not mention Agrippa at all, and that only the 'Antiquities' and Philo do so. We may also express skepticism about Josephus' account, since he does not mention that the Jews took up arms, whereas Tacitus (Hist. 5. 9) says specifically that they did.

MASSARO and MONTGOMERY (1469e) note that all the extant sources, including Josephus, agree in depicting Caligula as a madman. The authors discuss modern theories that he was an alcoholic or victim of hyperthyroidism or a psychopath, and conclude that he may have suffered from more than one disorder.

#### 15.14: The Citizenship of the Alexandrian Jews and Claudius' Edict

- (1470) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Citizenship of the Alexandrian Jews and on Claudius' Edict (Ant. xix. 280–285). Appendix Q. In: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. Pp. 583–585.
- (1471) WILLIAM W. TARN and GUY T. GRIFFITH: Hellenism and the Jews. In their: Hellenistic Civilization. 3rd ed., London 1952. Pp. 210–238. Trans. into German: Die Kultur der hellenistischen Welt. Darmstadt 1966.
- (1472) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: The Orthodoxy of the Jews in Hellenistic Egypt. In: Jewish Social Studies 22, 1960, pp. 215–237.
- (1473) HAROLD IDRIS BELL: Jews and Christians in Egypt. London 1924. Pp. 1–37.
- (1474) HAROLD IDRIS BELL: Anti-Semitism in Alexandria. In: Journal of Roman Studies 31, 1941, pp. 1–18.
- (1475) HERBERT A. MUSURILLO, ed.: The Acts of the Pagan Martyrs: Acta Alexandrinorum. Oxford 1954.
- (1476) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: Prolegomena. In his: Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass. 1957. Pp. 1–111.
- (1477) HERBERT BOX: Philonis Alexandrini In Flaccum. London 1939.
- (1478) THADÉE ZIELIŃSKI: L'Empereur Claude et l'idée de la domination mondiale des Juifs. In: Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles 32, 1926–27, pp. 128–148.
- (1479) THÉODORE REINACH: L'Empereur Claudius et les Juifs d'après un nouveau document. In: Revue des Études juives 79, 1924, pp. 113–144.
- (1480) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: Claudius' Edict in Antiquities, XIX, 280ff. In his: Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews. Philadelphia 1959. Appendix IV. Pp. 409–415.
- (1481) SIMON DAVIS: The Question of Jewish Citizenship at Alexandria. In his: Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt: Greek, Egyptian, Hebrew, Roman. London 1951; New York 1952. Pp. 93–112.
- (1481a) GEDALIAH ALLON: A History of the Jews in Palestine during the Period of the Mishnah and Talmud (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Tel-Aviv 1961.
- (1482) VINCENT M. SCRAMUZZA: The Emperor Claudius. Cambridge, Mass. 1940.
- (1483) ANGELO SEGRÉ: The Status of the Jews in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt: New Light from the Papyri. In: Jewish Social Studies 6, 1944, pp. 375–400.

- (1484) I. (= JOSEPH) D. AMOUSSINE: The Letter and Edict of the Emperor Claudius: Their Authenticity in Josephus (in Russian). In: *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii Moskva* (Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk, ul. Frunze 19) 2, 1949, pp. 221–228.
- (1485) SIMEON L. GUTERMAN: *Religious Tolerance and Persecution in Ancient Rome*. London 1951.
- (1486) CLARA KRAUS: *Filone Alessandrino e un'ora Tragica della storia Ebraica*. Napoli 1967.
- (1487) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: The Legal Status of the Jewish Communities in the Diaspora. In: SAMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, ed., *The Jewish People in the First Century* (*Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, vol. 1). Assen 1974. Pp. 420–463.
- (1488) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: The Decline and Fall of the Jewish Diaspora in Egypt in the Roman Period. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 14, 1963, pp. 1–32.
- (1488a) SALO W. BARON: *The Jewish Community. Its History and Structure to the American Revolution*. 3 vols. Philadelphia 1942.
- (1488b) H(AROLD) IDRIS BELL: *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Liverpool 1953; 2nd ed. 1954.
- (1488c) ERNST LUDWIG EHRLICH: *Geschichte Israels von den Anfängen bis zur Zerstörung des Tempels* (70 n. Chr.). Berlin 1958. Trans. into English by JAMES BARR: *A Concise History of Israel: From the Earliest Times to the Destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70*. London 1962.
- (1488d) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: Christianity under Claudius. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 44, 1961–62, pp. 309–326.
- (1488e) MARCEL SIMON: A propos de la Lettre de Claude aux Alexandrins. In: *Bulletin de la Faculté des Lettres de Strasbourg*, 1943, pp. 175–183. Reprinted in his: *Recherches d'histoire judéo-chrétienne*, Paris 1962, pp. 20–29.
- (1488f) HEINZ HEINEN: *Rom und Ägypten von 51 bis 47 v. Chr.: Untersuchungen zur Regierungszeit der 7. Kleopatra und des 13. Ptolemäers*. Diss. Tübingen 1966.
- (1488g) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, trans. and ed.: *Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 31: In Flaccum. Paris 1967.
- (1488h) EDUARD LOHSE: *Umwelt des Neuen Testaments*. (Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament, Bd. 1). Göttingen 1971. Trans. into English by JOHN E. STEELY: *The New Testament Environment*. Nashville 1976.
- (1488i) ARIÉ (ARYEH) KASHER: The Civic Status of the Jews in Egypt and Their Rights in the Hellenistic and Roman Period (in Hebrew). Diss., Tel-Aviv Univ. 1972.
- (1488j) ARYEH KASHER: The Evidence of Philo on the Rights of the Jews of Alexandria (in Hebrew). In: *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Jerusalem 1973. Vol. 2, pp. 35–45.
- (1488k) ARYE KASHER: The Circumstances of Claudius Caesar's Edict and of His Letter to the Alexandrians (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 39, 1974, pp. 1–7.
- (1488l) ARIÉ KASHER: Les circonstances de la promulgation de l'édit de l'empereur Claude et de sa lettre aux Alexandrins (41 ap.J.-C.). In: *Semitica* 26, 1976, pp. 99–108. (= French version of article in Hebrew in *Zion*, 1488k).
- (1488m) ARYEH KASHER: The Jewish Attitude to the Alexandrian Gymnasium in the First Century A.D. In: *American Journal of Ancient History* 1, 1976, pp. 148–161.
- (1488n) ARYEH KASHER: The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt (in Hebrew). (Publications of the Diaspora Research Institute, ed. SHLOMO SIMONSOHN, vol. 23) (= revised version of his doctoral dissertation, 1488i). Tel-Aviv 1978.
- (1488o) RICHARD D. SULLIVAN: The Dynasty of Judaea in the First Century. In: WOLFGANG HAASE and HILDEGARD TEMPORINI, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.8, 1977, pp. 296–354.
- (1488p) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*. New York 1979.

(1488q) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: *The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic-Roman Age in the Light of the Papyri* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1945; 2nd ed. 1963.

(1488r) D. HENNIG: *Zu neuveröffentlichten Bruchstücken der 'Acta Alexandrinorum'*. In: *Chiron* 5, 1975, pp. 317–335.

I (1470) have a select bibliography on the vast literature concerning the citizenship of the Alexandrian Jews and on Claudius' edict.

TARN (1471), the great historian of the Hellenistic period, argues that it is inconceivable that the Jews were citizens of Alexandria, Antioch, or any other Greek city, since full citizenship entailed worship of the gods of the city, and this meant apostasy to the Jews. In answer, however, we may suggest, though admittedly we have no evidence, that perhaps the Jews were granted an exemption from this worship of the Ptolemies, just as in later times they were granted exemptions by the Roman emperors from worship of the emperors as gods; and, in any case, as I (1472) have indicated, the Jews of Alexandria were hardly 'orthodox' in the Palestinian sense; and we know from the papyri that there were some Jews at least who were citizens. Josephus (*Ant.* 14. 188) says explicitly that Julius Caesar set up a bronze tablet for the Jews in Alexandria declaring that they were citizens of Alexandria; Philo (*In Flaccum* 47) similarly speaks of Jewish citizens; and in *In Flaccum* 78–80, while not explicitly stating that the Jews were citizens, he does say that the Jews were classed with the Alexandrians when it came to the method whereby they might be beaten.

However, ever since the publication in 1924 by BELL (1473) of a papyrus in which Claudius addresses the Alexandrians (*Ἀλεξανδρεῖς μὲν*, line 82) and the Jews (*Ἰουδαῖοις δέ*, line 88), with the contrast clearly marked by the *μὲν* and *δέ*, most scholars, for example BELL (1474), in a survey of the history of the Jews of Alexandria until their expulsion from Alexandria in the fifth century C.E., have concluded that the Jews were not legally 'Alexandrians', citizens of Alexandria. A crucial phrase in the letter (line 95) speaks of the Jews as living "in a city not their own" (*ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ πόλει*); and it is unlikely that Claudius, who appears impartial in the rest of the letter, would speak thus of the Jews if they were citizens of Alexandria. Finally, the letter forbids the Jews to participate in the athletic contests presided over by the gymnasiarchs and *cosmetae*; and it is probable that participation in the games was restricted to citizens.

Most scholars assume that the edict quoted in Josephus and the letter in the papyrus are two separate documents, but MUSURILLO (1475) argues that it is difficult to believe that there were two separate edicts within such a short time to settle the same dispute. To this we may reply that both are presented in the official texts of documents; and they clearly differ in details and in language. In view of the long history of bitter controversy between the Greeks and Jews in Alexandria and because of its far-reaching consequences to the huge Jewish community throughout the Roman world, it is not unlikely that the matter would have commanded Claudius' attention on more than one occasion.

It is possible that the situation in Alexandria, or Claudius' view of the situation, had changed between the time that he had issued the edict quoted by Josephus (*Ant.* 19. 280–285) and the time that he composed the letter quoted in the papyrus, and perhaps, as indicated by TCHERIKOVER (1476), pp. 72–73, he

was particularly disgusted by new factors indicated in the letter, namely, the sending of delegations by two separate factions of the Jewish community and the influx of Jews into Alexandria from the Egyptian countryside and from Palestine.

Box (1477) suggests that Josephus' view that the Jews had citizenship in Alexandria may be explained by his false assumption (War 2. 487) that all Alexandrian Jews had equal privileges with the Macedonians and by the false identification of Macedonians = Greeks = Alexandrians. We may comment that in only one place (Ant. 14. 188) does Josephus say explicitly that the Jews were citizens; elsewhere, as here, in War 2. 487, he resorts to circumlocutions, saying that the Jews were permitted to live on terms of equality (ἰσομοιρία, variant ἰσοτιμία) with the Greeks.

ZIELIŃSKI (1478), wrongly assuming the identity of the edict and the letter, solves the problem of apparent contradictions by asserting that the former was completely forged. Others, such as REINACH (1479), have sought to reconcile the two by suggesting that portions of the edict have been interpolated, notably the reference to the Jews as Alexandrians (Ant. 19. 281). TCHERIKOVER (1480) concludes that the edict in Josephus has been reworked by forgers who converted Jewish privileges into civic rights, though, as we have objected, the term ἰση πολιτεία (Ant. 19. 281) may mean merely that the Jews had equal status as a community and not equal status as citizens.

TARN (1471) argues that the Jews did not claim full citizenship but only isopolity, that is potential citizenship, so that a Jew could become a citizen if he satisfied the requirement, namely of apostasy by worshipping the city gods. But, as we see in the trial of Socrates, who was charged with not worshipping the city gods, such worship was a formal matter; and many Jews, especially in the more liberal atmosphere of Alexandria, may have conformed to some *pro forma* participation. We may comment that the Jews claimed that they were Alexandrians, whereas Claudius did not commit himself on this question, that it was not unduly biased for Claudius to assert that the Jews were residents of Alexandria from the earliest times since this does not mean that they were entitled to citizenship, and that the term ἰση πολιτεία (Ant. 19. 281) may mean not "equal citizen status" but equal status as a community (πολίτευμα: see DAVIS [1481], pp. 101–107), and we know that the Jewish community of Alexandria was autonomous under its own ethnarchs, as is indicated by the edict (Ant. 19. 283). Another possibility, as plausibly suggested by ALLON (1481a), p. 227, who is aware of the way that politicians have usually behaved, is that the Jews actually did enjoy isopolity, but that the Ptolemies and the Romans after them had always carefully avoided giving a precise definition of this term.

In any case, we may conclude, Philo and Josephus, particularly the latter, since he was removed from the scene, may well be guilty of wishful thinking in their apologetics; and their legal and technical terminology is likely to be looser than that of the emperor Claudius, whose letter on papyrus is, after all, first-hand evidence of what the emperor actually said. If we are left with the problem of the decree of Julius Caesar cited in Antiquities 14. 188 declaring publicly that the Jews were citizens of Alexandria, we may suggest that perhaps this refers

only to those who were already there and not to later immigrants; or we may state, as does REINACH (1479), that Julius Caesar could not have issued such a proclamation, since he had no legal right to do it, inasmuch as this area was not then part of the Roman Empire.

SCRAMUZZA (1482) notes that III Maccabees 2. 30 contradicts Josephus when it says that Ptolemy Philopator (221–203 B.C.E.) ordered the Jews to be fellow-citizens of the Alexandrians but that they resisted the king's order and maintained their former status of *πολίτευμα*. SCRAMUZZA argues that the term *ἰση πολιτεία* in Antiquities 19. 281 is an interpolation.

SEGRÉ (1483), in a survey, well explains that the various passages which state that the Jews were granted the same privileges as the Macedonians, mean only that they were likewise regarded as 'established residents'. Commenting on Claudius' edict to Alexandria and Syria and to the rest of the world in Antiquities 19. 280–291, he appositely notes that in point of fact the civic status of the Jews depended to no small degree on the actualities of the political situation. He remarks that it was, in fact, far easier for Jews to become Roman citizens than to become Greek citizens.

I have not seen AMOUSSINE (1484).

GUTERMAN (1485) notes that the Jewish position both in the Hellenistic world, with its notion of nationality divorced from territoriality, which the Romans retained indigenously, and in the Roman world, with its rigorous doctrine of national exclusiveness, assumed a form constitutionally in conformance with its environment. He concludes that the Jews in Alexandria had only a special limited type of citizenship.

The most recent extensive treatment of the subject by KRAUS (1486), pp. 143–157, after surveying the vast scholarly literature, concludes that the problem of the effective juridical position of the Jews in Alexandria is insoluble.

APPLEBAUM (1487), pp. 434ff., concludes that Josephus' testimony on *ἰσοπολιτεία* in Alexandria is contradicted by the papyrus version of Claudius' letter.

In an excellent general survey, published posthumously, TCHERIKOVER (1488) wisely notes three factors that must be borne in mind in considering the fate of Egyptian Jewry during the Roman period: 1) Egypt was part of the Roman Empire, and therefore the situation of the Egyptian Jews depended on the general policy of Rome; 2) the Egyptian, especially the Alexandrian, Jews lived in a Greek environment, and consequently their lives were influenced by the attitude of the Greeks toward them; and 3) as part of the whole Jewish nation, Egyptian Jewry shared the fate of Jews elsewhere, especially those of Palestine. On this last point TCHERIKOVER cites War 2. 490ff. to establish the fact that the Egyptian Diaspora reacted promptly to the events of 66 in the land of Israel. But we must remark that the disturbance of 66 in Egypt was part of the history of continuous conflict between Greeks and Jews in Alexandria, that there is no indication in Josephus of a connection between this riot and the Palestinian outbreak, and in any case that there is no evidence that the Palestinian Jews received any help from Alexandria.

BARON (1488a), vol. 1, p. 132, and vol. 3, pp. 25–26, comments, in particular, on the status of Jewish citizenship under the Roman Empire.

BELL (1488b) asserts that there is no strong reason to doubt Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 19. 280–285) that the Jews formed an element in the population of Alexandria from its first foundation. However, on the basis of the statement in London Papyrus 1912 that the Jews are in a city not their own, he concludes that they were not citizens. As to the latter statement, we may comment, nevertheless, that the meaning may be only that the invitation to found the city had been Alexander's and that the Jews were there by invitation and as 'guests' of Alexander, so to speak.

EHRlich (1488c), pp. 95–96, presents a brief survey, showing a critical use of Josephus, in which he concludes that it can no longer be claimed, as it was by Josephus (*Ant.* 13. 62–68, *War* 7. 100–111), that the Jewish community of Alexandria as a whole had rights of citizenship. We may comment that the first passage speaks of the privileges granted to the Egyptian Jews to build a temple at Leontopolis but says nothing about citizenship; and that the second passage speaks of the privileges (without, incidentally, specifying citizenship) of the Jews of Antioch, a city in the Seleucid Empire, without any indication that these privileges were extended to Jews in Alexandria, a city in the Ptolemaic Empire.

BRUCE (1488d) concludes that the edict reproduced by Josephus (*Ant.* 19. 279) appears to be in a substantially accurate form. He asserts, commenting on *Antiquities* 19. 278, that the significance of the illegal Jewish immigration into Alexandria from Syria and the rest of Egypt is probably to be found in the statement of Josephus that the Jews of Alexandria, having obtained no satisfaction from Gaius Caligula, took up arms when the news of his death arrived.

SIMON (1488e), pp. 24, 27–28, commenting on *War* 2. 398, 7. 43, *Antiquities* 14. 115, *Apion* 2. 33, 2. 42, and 2. 72, objects to a 'Christian' interpretation of the Letter of Claudius, and concludes that the allusion in the letter is not to two sects of Jews but to Alexandrian Judaism and its pagan milieu.

HEINEN (1488f), p. 114, commenting on *Antiquities* 14. 188 and *Apion* 2. 37, is skeptical with regard to the rights of Jews in Alexandria.

PELLETIER (1488g), pp. 172–181, commenting on the political status of the Jews in Alexandria, concludes that Philo and Josephus agree, but that Josephus shows a greater tenacity in seeking to rehabilitate the Jewish people. The Jews, says PELLETIER, sought to preserve their independent interior organization. He concludes that the title 'Macedonians' is less a guarantee of their politically privileged position than it is a title to preserve the respect of the Graeco-Roman world after the humiliation of the destruction of the Temple in 70.

LOHSE (1488h), pp. 121–122, comments briefly on the numbers and rights of the Jews in the Diaspora according to Josephus.

KASHER (1488i), in his doctoral dissertation and in part of a chapter of that dissertation (1488j), argues that the London Papyrus 1912 strengthens the hand of those who say that the Jews were not citizens, because it is in complete contradiction to Claudius' edict cited by Josephus (*Ant.* 19. 280ff.). He concludes that the Jews fought for self-determination rather than for citizenship and that it was for this purpose that Philo went on his embassy to Caligula.

KASHER (1488k)(1488l) asserts that Claudius issued the edict cited by Josephus (Ant. 19. 280–285) in the spring of 41 as a result of the Jewish riots against the Greeks and native Egyptians in Alexandria, whereas the letter to the Alexandrians (London Papyrus 1912), issued in response to totally different circumstances, was promulgated in the autumn of that year following riots by the Greeks. There is only a limited connection between the earlier riot and the promulgation of the edict, which shows considerable sympathy with the Jews, whereas in the letter Claudius vents his anger at both sides for their mutual acts of hostility.

KASHER (1488m), based on a chapter of the author's doctoral dissertation, argues against TCHERIKOVER's (1480) claim that the Alexandrian Jews attempted to gain citizenship in the Greek *polis* by infiltrating the gymnasium. Since religious apostasy was involved in obtaining citizenship, it is doubtful that many Jews were ready to make this concession. We may, however, comment that many Jews then, just as today, were probably less worried about the inconsistency involved in religious attitudes: indeed, we may call attention to their syncretistic attitude toward art and the occult. Jews then hardly kept away from the gymnasium and the theatre, as we see from anti-Semitic spectacles in the theatre of Antioch (e.g., War 7. 47–48), Alexandria, and Caesarea. Claudius' warning in London Papyrus 1912 does not refer to Jewish infiltration into the list of ephebes but was meant to deter Jews from attending public games, since by so doing they might easily inflame tempers and cause another war. Similarly, in Josephus (Ant. 19. 290), in Claudius' edict, the Jews were commanded not to mock the worship of other people and to take care only to observe their own laws. Finally, KASHER insists here, as elsewhere, that the Jews fought not for citizenship but for the right of self-organization and self-government within the city territory on an equal footing with the Greek citizens but independent of the *polis* itself and answerable only to the central government.

KASHER (1488n), pp. 238–276, stresses that the Jews' struggle for equal political rights in Egypt should be interpreted not as one seeking citizenship but as a desire for equality of two separate political bodies, the Jewish community (*politeuma*) and the Greek *polis*. He compares the rights of the Jews of Caesarea and of Antioch, stressing the separation of the Jewish community from the municipal Greek (or Syrian) organization and the equal organizational status of the two political bodies. He concludes that the Alexandrian Jews were not citizens of the Greek *polis*; but, we may comment, what troubles KASHER is that citizens would have to be apostates, worshipping the gods of the *polis*, whereas we may note that the papyri, with their extensive evidence of assimilation and even syncretism, show that this was not a problem to some, at least. Moreover, we may add, to use the term *πολίται* as indicating membership in a Jewish *politeuma* rather than citizenship would surely be confusing to the average reader. KASHER attempts to establish the credibility of Josephus' account of the beginning of the Jewish colonization of Alexandria on the ground of the assumption that the Jewish community there was founded on the basis of a military settlement. He, moreover, insists that the edict of Claudius (Ant. 19. 280ff.) is authentic, that it was composed in the spring of 41, and that it is by no

means to be confused with his Letter to the Alexandrians (London Papyrus 1912).

SULLIVAN (1488o), pp. 347–349, asserts that the Alexandrian Jews enjoyed certain privileges, but that this was far from full citizenship, since Jews did not have the right to enter gymnasia.

SANDMEL (1488p), pp. 7–9, accepts the conclusion of TCHERIKOVER (1480) that the Jews of Alexandria did not possess fullest equality in the matter of civil rights, despite the term *ισοπολίτας* used by Josephus (Ant. 12. 8).

TCHERIKOVER (1488q), pp. 116–159, commenting on the civic status of Jews in Egypt during the Roman period, notes that there are very few Roman citizens among the Jews mentioned in the papyri. He stresses that the Letter of Claudius, far from showing his favor toward the Jews, as is often thought, put an end to the emancipation of the Alexandrian Jews.

I have not seen HENNIG (1488r) on newly discovered fragments of the 'Acta Alexandrinorum'.

### 15.15: Josephus on Philo and His Family

(1488t) MAX POHLENZ: Philon von Alexandria. In: Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, N.F. 1, no. 5. Göttingen 1942. Pp. 409–487.

POHLENZ (1488t), pp. 412–415, co-ordinates Philo and Josephus (Ant. 20. 100, War 6. 237) with regard to the alabarch Alexander and Tiberius Julius Alexander.

### 15.16: The Status of the Jews in Syria, Especially Antioch

(1489) GLANVILLE DOWNEY: A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest. Princeton 1961.

(1490) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period. 13 vols. New York 1953–68.

(1491) CARL H. KRAELING: The Jewish Community at Antioch. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 51, 1932, pp. 130–160.

(1492) GLANVILLE DOWNEY: Ancient Antioch. Princeton 1963.

(1492a) BEN ZION LURIE: The Jews in Syria in the Days of the Return to Zion, the Mishnah, and the Talmud (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1957.

(1492b) ARYEH KASHER: The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt (in Hebrew) (Publications of the Diaspora Research Institute, ed. SHLOMO SIMONSOHN, vol. 23) (= revised version of his doctoral dissertation, 1488i). Tel-Aviv 1978.

(1492c) WAYNE A. MEEKS and ROBERT L. WILKEN: Jews and Christians in Antioch in the First Four Centuries of the Common Era. Missoula, Montana 1978.

DOWNEY (1489), pp. 79–80, 107–111, 198–201, says that Josephus' claim (Ant. 12.119) that the Jews were citizens of Antioch is patently false, since this would involve worship of the city gods, and that it is more likely that individual Jews were so privileged; but, as we have already commented in connection with



the question of the citizenship of the Alexandrian Jews, worship of the city gods was a formal matter; and, moreover, as GOODENOUGH (1490) has amply shown, the masses of Jews, and even some of the rabbis, when it came to matters of pagan symbols, were more liberal than would appear from the strict Biblical and some Talmudic prescriptions.

DOWNEY follows KRAELING (1491) in disputing Josephus' statement (War 2. 479) that the Greeks in Antioch abstained from attacks on Jews in 66 because of their pity for men who showed no revolutionary intentions. More probably, say KRAELING and DOWNEY, disorder was averted by the action of the governor of Syria, Cestius Gallus. This comment, we may add, is perhaps valid, but since Josephus says nothing of Gallus' activities in Antioch, Sidon, and Apamea, the three cities where there were no uprisings, we may suggest that perhaps the large numbers of Roman troops stationed in these population centers may have acted as a deterrent, or, alternatively, the fact that these cities had the largest concentration of Jews; less likely is Josephus' alternate suggestion (War 2. 479), which he presents with some diffidence, that with their own vast populations these cities disdained the possibility of Jewish uprisings.

DOWNEY (1492) presents a condensed version of his 'History of Antioch' for the non-specialist.

LURIE (1492a) has a systematic survey, city by city, of the Jews of Syria.

KASHER (1492b), comparing the political status of the Jews of Antioch with that of the Alexandrian Jews, concludes that in both cases the Jewish community did not seek citizenship but rather developed a *politeuma* of its own.

MEEKS and WILKEN (1492c), pp. 3–5, use Josephus as a major source for the history of the Jews of Antioch, their rights, and anti-Semitism. In commenting on War 7. 110–111, which declares that Titus left the status of the Jews of Antioch exactly as it had been before, they assert that Josephus may have put too happy a face on the situation, for Malalas (Chronographia 260–261, ed. DINDORF) reports that the Emperor set up several bronze figures, presumably from the Temple, outside the southern gate of the city, where the Jews were concentrated and where the figures were calculated to remind them of the fall of Jerusalem.

### 15.17: The Jews of Asia Minor

(1492d) LEA ROTH-GARSON: The Civil and Religious Status of the Jews in Asia Minor from Alexander the Great to Constantine, B.C. 336–A.D. 337. Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1972.

(1492e) ALF THOMAS KRAABEL: Judaism in West Asia Minor under the Roman Empire, with a Preliminary Study of the Jewish Community of Sardis, Lydia. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1968.

(1492f) ALF THOMAS KRAABEL: Paganism and Judaism: The Sardis Evidence. In: Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon. Paris 1978. Pp. 13–33.

I have not seen ROTH-GARSON (1492d). [See *infra*, p. 928.]

I have not seen KRAABEL (1492e). [See *infra*, p. 928.]

KRAABEL (1492f) concludes, on the basis of the recent excavations at Sardis, that enjoyment by the Jews of a Gentile culture did not cause assimilation. He explains this strength of the Jews by the fact that there were so many pagans so close nearby; but, we may comment, if modern analogies, such as the Jewish community in China before 1912, are an indication, this is hardly a preservative. More likely, the fact that the Jews were so numerous and perhaps anti-Semitism, of which we know little for Asia Minor, were major factors. He notes that Antiquities 14. 235 and 259–261 refer to the τόπος of Sardis, and suggests that the word τόπος refers not to a synagogue, as is generally thought, but to a public building. The decrees cited by Josephus, he concludes, are a sign not of the community's need for protection but of its prestige.

### 15.18: The Status of the Jews in Cyrene

- (1493) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: Jewish Status at Cyrene in the Roman Period. In: La Parola del Passato, Rivista di Studi Antichi 19, 1964, pp. 291–303. Trans. into Hebrew (revised) in: M. DORMAN, SHMUEL SAFRAI, and MENAHEM STERN, edd.: In Memory of Gedaliahu Alon, Essays in Jewish History and Philology. Tel-Aviv 1970. Pp. 192–222.
- (1494) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1969. Trans. into English (revised): Leiden 1979.
- (1494a) BUNZO AIZAWA: Judean Revolt at Cyrene (in Japanese). In: Hirosakidaigaku bunkei ron sho (Collection of Articles, Departments of Literature and Economics, Hirosaki University), no. 1, Nov. 1965, pp. 481–502.

APPLEBAUM (1493), commenting on Marcus Agrippa's order to the Cyrenaeans (Ant. 16. 169) to permit the Jews to send their contributions to the Temple in Jerusalem without interference, suggests that Josephus may have telescoped two distinct episodes, one a threat by sycophants to inform on some issue of whose nature we are ignorant and the second a stoppage of the Temple dues by the *polis* on the allegation of unpaid taxes. In the rescript, we may note, the Jews are said to have complained that they were being threatened by certain συκοφανταί and prevented from sending their money on the pretext of their owing taxes. We need not, however, we may reply, presuppose two separate episodes, especially since Josephus is here quoting Agrippa's rescript; we may say that there were, in fact, people who accused the Jews of sending money out of the country when they still owed taxes to the government; when the charge was investigated, it was discovered that the Jews had paid their taxes. As we learn earlier (Ant. 16. 160), the Greeks of Cyrene were at this time persecuting the Jews by taking away from them the sacred money destined for the Temple.

In Antiquities 16. 160 Josephus refers to the equality of civic status (ἰσονομία) which the Jews of Cyrene enjoyed. APPLEBAUM (1493) comments that their actual status was neither that of citizens nor that of metics; apparently, as at Alexandria, we may comment, their status was deliberately ambiguous. [For APPLEBAUM (1494) see *infra*, p. 929.]

I have not seen AIZAWA (1494a).

### 15.19: The Jews of Rome

(1494b) SAM WAAGENAAR: *The Pope's Jews*. LaSalle, Illinois 1974.

WAAGENAAR (1494b), pp. 2–8, has a popular history of the Jews of Rome which is largely dependent upon Josephus.

### 15.20: Agrippa II and Berenice

- (1495) YA'AKOV MESHORER: *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1966. Trans. into English by I. H. LEVINE. Tel-Aviv 1967.
- (1496) JOHN A. CROOK: Titus and Berenice. In: *American Journal of Philology* 72, 1951, pp. 162–175.
- (1497) THÉRÈSE FRANKFORT: Le royaume d'Agrippa II et son annexion par Domitien. In: MARCEL RENARD, ed., *Hommages à Albert Grenier*. Brussels 1962. Pp. 659–672.
- (1498) THÉRÈSE FRANKFORT: La date de l'Autobiographie de Flavius Josèphe et des œuvres de Justus de Tibériade. In: *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 39, 1961, pp. 52–58.
- (1499) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.–A.D. 135). Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR, Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973.
- (1500) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Giessen 1920.
- (1501) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans.: *Josephus*, vol. 1, *The Life, Against Apion* (Loeb Classical Library). London 1926.
- (1502) HENRI SEYRIG: Sur quelques ères syriennes. In: *Revue numismatique* 6. Series, vol. 6, 1964, pp. 51–67.
- (1503) HENRI SEYRIG: Antiquités Syriennes: Un officier d'Agrippa II. In: *Syria* 42, 1965, pp. 31–34.
- (1504) M. DUNAND: *Mission archéologique au Djebel Druze: le musée de Soueïda*. Paris 1934.
- (1505) BACCHISIO MOTZO: *Saggi di storia e letteratura giudeo-ellenistica*. Firenze 1924.
- (1506) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, ed. and trans.: *Flavius Josèphe Autobiographie*. Paris 1959.
- (1507) TESSA RAJAK: Justus of Tiberias. In: *Classical Quarterly* 23, 1973, pp. 345–368.
- (1508) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (1508a) RUTH JORDAN: *Berenice*. New York 1974.
- (1508b) EMILIO GABBA: L'impero romano nel discorso di Agrippa II (Ioseph., B.I. II, 345–401). In: *Rivista Storica dell'Antichità* 6–7, 1976–77, pp. 189–194.
- (1508c) ANTHONY A. BARRETT: Sohaemus, King of Emesa and Sophene. In: *American Journal of Philology* 98, 1977, pp. 153–159.

MESHORER (1495) argues that the date (49/50) mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 20. 104) as the first regnal year of Agrippa II is incompatible with at least some of the data on his coins and suggests, on the basis of these coins, that we should date Agrippa's reign from 56.

CROOK (1496) connects the romance of Titus and Berenice, Agrippa II's sister, with the political history of 69–79, and suggests that the Flavian coup in 69 derived support from an Oriental group led by Tiberius Julius Alexander and Berenice. But, we may comment, Alexander, who was an apostate from Judaism,

could hardly be regarded as an Oriental and certainly commanded no Jewish support after slaughtering 50,000 Jews in Alexandria in 66.

FRANKFORT (1497) concludes that the Roman policy toward Agrippa II was determined by Rome's need to be sure that the desert border was adequately guarded by local potentates. She (1498) rejects the date (early second century) usually given for the publication of the 'Life' and suggests 93/94–96 (Life 359 definitely indicates that Agrippa is already dead, and the ninth-century Byzantine encyclopedist Photius, *Bibliotheca*, p. 33, says that Agrippa died in the third year of the reign of Trajan, i.e. 100). She argues that Josephus (Ant. 20. 145) could not have mentioned the rumor of Agrippa II's relations with his sister Berenice if he were not already dead. Moreover, the 'Life', she says, flatters Domitian and mentions no subsequent emperor, and she implies that it would hardly be in character for a born flatterer such as Josephus not to flatter on the current emperor if it were Nerva or Trajan. In her later article (1497) she favors a date of 92 for the death of Agrippa II on the basis of coins, inscriptions, and the passage (Life 359–360) which speaks of Agrippa as no longer alive. She discounts the evidence in Photius on the ground that the chronologists give various dates for the beginning of Trajan's reign. Her conclusion is shared by the revised SCHÜRER (1499), pp. 481–483.

Josephus himself (Ant. 20. 266) indicates that he will append his 'Life' to his 'Antiquities' just before (Ant. 20. 267) he dates the completion of the latter as the thirteenth year of the reign of Domitian (93/94). LAQUEUR (1500), p. 5, and THACKERAY (1501), pp. xiii–xiv, have argued that the 'Antiquities' appeared in two editions, the first in 93/94 and the second some years later.

Further evidence perhaps of a second edition of the 'Antiquities' has been noted by SEYRIG (1502), pp. 55–56, who remarks that in *Antiquities* 17. 28 Josephus speaks of the status of Batanaea, after its rule by Agrippa II had been terminated in 93 at the earliest, as an inscription shows. Unless, as SEYRIG admits, there was only a partial annexation (of which we know nothing) which occurred in the lifetime of Agrippa, the passage must belong to the second edition; but, we may reply, inasmuch as the annexation may have occurred in 93, this may have been among the last revisions in the first edition, which was issued in late 93 or 94. SEYRIG (1503) does refer, however, to an inscription from the Hauran or Djebel Druze mentioning a man who passed directly from the service of Agrippa to that of Trajan, and this would seem to support Photius' dating; but another inscription, cited by DUNAND (1504), p. 49, and dated in 96, implies that Agrippa's rule has ended. MOTZO (1505), pp. 217–219, suggests that the 'Life' itself appeared in two editions, the second as a reply to the attacks of Justus of Tiberias; but the unity of its style, as PELLETIER (1506), has shown, argues against this; and RAJAK (1507), p. 361, furthermore asks why Josephus should have rewritten his autobiography rather than simply sit down and write a defence. She concludes that it is best to take Photius's date as a simple mistake and notes that in the chronological tables of the eighth-century George Syncellus, who probably derived his error from the third-century Christian chronographer Julius Africanus, the third year of Trajan appears to be ninety-two years after the birth of Jesus.

COHEN (1508) correctly objects, however, that it is illegitimate to try thus to save Photius, because according to Photius' dating, *Antiquities* 20. 267 would not indicate 93/94 but a much earlier date. He concludes that the anti-Agrippa passages do not prove either an early death for Agrippa II or numerous editions for the 'Antiquities', and that *Antiquities* 16. 187, where Josephus says that he will not be afraid to enter into disputes with the royal Hasmonians, is a rhetorical response to a passage from Nicolaus of Damascus' autobiography.

JORDAN (1508a), in a popular biography of Berenice, Agrippa II's sister, concludes that she was neither the noble heroine, as she is depicted in seventeenth century French tragedies, nor the calculating whore of some modern writings, but rather, as Josephus implies, a woman who had both her faults and her virtues.

GABBA (1508b) stresses that Agrippa's speech, emphasizing the role of Fortune, is not in contradiction with the most profound religious and cultural roots of his people.

BARRETT (1508c) argues that Sohaemus, who was connected by marriage with Agrippa II and who, according to Tacitus (*Annals* 13. 7), was given the territory of Sophene on the border of Armenia, is the same as the newly established king of Emesa in Syria. As for the objection that the territories were separated by a considerable distance, BARRETT cites two parallels. The importance of Sophene in any campaign involving Armenia in 54 and in the destruction of Sohaemus of Emesa virtually rules out the possibility that a second unknown Sohaemus is intended. Moreover, since Tacitus (*Annals* 13. 7) mentions Sohaemus without further identification, it seems likely that there was only one.

### 15.21: Izates and Adiabene (see also 24.1)

- (1509) PAUL WINTER: *Monogenēs para patros*. In: *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 5, 1953, pp. 335–365.
- (1510) SHELDON A. NODELMAN: A Preliminary History of Characene. In: *Berytus* 13, 1959–60, pp. 83–121.
- (1511) FRANZ ALTHEIM and RUTH STIEHL: Jüdische Mission unter den Arabern. In their: *Die Araber in der Alten Welt*. Vol. 2. Berlin 1965. Pp. 64–75.
- (1512) JAVIER TEIXIDOR: The Kingdom of Adiabene and Hatra. In: *Berytus* 17, 1967–68, pp. 1–11.
- (1512a) JACQUELINE PIRENNE: Aux Origines de la Graphie Syriaque. In: *Syria* 40, 1963, pp. 101–137.
- (1512b) ISAAH GAFNI: The Conversion of the Kings of Adiabene in the Light of Talmudic Literature (in Hebrew). In: *Niv HaMidrashiah* 1971, pp. 204–212.
- (1512c) GEO WIDENGREN: The Status of the Jews in the Sassanian Empire. In: *Iranica Antiqua* 1, 1961, pp. 117–162.
- (1512d) JOSEPH A. FITZMYER and DANIEL J. HARRINGTON: *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (Second Century B.C. – Second Century A.D.)* (*Biblica et Orientalia*, 34). Rome 1978.
- (1512e) BENJAMIN MAZAR: Herodian Jerusalem in the Light of the Excavations South and South-West of the Temple Mount. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 28, 1978, pp. 230–237.

WINTER (1509) interprets *μονογενής* as applied to Izates in Antiquities 20. 20 in the sense of “favorite”, “best-beloved”, or “one who has no equal”; but, we may comment, the very fact that Josephus says that he was treated ‘as if’ he were an only child shows that *μονογενής* itself is to be taken literally.

NODELMAN (1510), pp. 97–100, comments on Abennerigus (Ant. 20. 22), the king of Charax Spasini to whom Izates was sent by his father Monobazus. On one of his coins his name is spelled Abinerglos, but since this coin has other obvious errors, he prefers Josephus’ spelling (or rather Abinergaos), although we may comment that the manuscripts of Josephus differ on the spelling, one of the major manuscripts having *Σαβιννήριον*. NODELMAN proceeds to reconstruct the chief events of his reign, which he dates, partly on numismatic evidence, as lasting from 30 to 36 C.E.

ALTHEIM and STIEHL (1511) comment on the fact that Izates and his father Monobazus have Iranian names. They utilize Iranian, Armenian, and Talmudic sources in a general survey of the conversion of Izates.

On the basis of his analysis of Antiquities 20. 17–91, TEIXIDOR (1512) identifies a statue of *ʿtlw* found in Hatra and now in the Iraq Museum of Baghdad as that of Izates. Since the name *ʿtlw* in Arabic means “to be of noble origin”, and the name of Izates is a variant of Azada (Azades), “free” or “noble”, and since, moreover, the figure in the statue is wearing a tiara, and Josephus (Ant. 20. 67) says that Artabanus II permitted Izates to wear his tiara upright, TEIXIDOR says that the statue, which was made nearly a century after the death of Izates, was intended to inaugurate the official establishment of the cult of ancestors at Hatra. If so, we may wonder why the inhabitants of Hatra, which is not in Adiabene, should have sought to honor the conqueror of their territory and why they should have put up a statue to one for whom statues were prohibited by his religion.

PIRENNE (1512a), pp. 102–109, concludes that the sarcophagus, previously identified as that of Queen Helena of Adiabene (Ant. 20. 17–96), may now be dated through an analysis of the script as belonging to the third century C.E.

GAFNI (1512b) concludes that Josephus is in agreement with the Talmud on the question of the attitude toward the requirement of circumcision in the conversion of the kings of Adiabene.

WIDENGREN (1512c), pp. 18 and 124–125, commenting on the Jewish regime in Adiabene, notes that Adiabene was organized in conformance with typically Parthian traditions.

FITZMYER and HARRINGTON (1512d), pp. 243–244, comment on the inscription on the tomb of Queen Helena of Adiabene (Ant. 20. 95). They note that the identification of this sarcophagus as Helena’s rests on the evidence of Josephus’ (Ant. 20. 95) locating the tomb in the vicinity of Jerusalem and of the description of the person in the sarcophagus as a queen.

MAZAR (1512e) tentatively identifies one excavated building in Jerusalem as a palace built by the royal family of Adiabene (War 4. 567, 5. 252–253, 6. 355).

**15.22: Nero**

- (1513) EVA M. SANFORD: Nero and the East. In: *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 48, 1937, pp. 75–103.
- (1514) S. J. BASTOMSKY: The Emperor Nero in Talmudic Legend. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 59, 1968–69, pp. 321–325.
- (1515) HENRY W. KAMP: Seneca and Other Tutors of Nero. In: *Classical Weekly* 36, 1942–43, p. 151.
- (1516) GILBERT CHARLES PICARD: Néron et le blé d'Afrique. In: *Les Cahiers de Tunisie* 4, 1956, pp. 163–173.
- (1517) MICHAEL GRANT: Nero. London 1970.

SANFORD (1513) co-ordinates the data about Nero from Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius and notes Nero's special place in Jewish eyes. Josephus, we may add, carefully notes (*Ant.* 20. 154) that there were some historians who spoke favorably of Nero, but because all of these have been lost we tend to have a one-sided picture of him. Moreover, as BASTOMSKY (1514) has noted, according to Talmudic tradition (*Giṭṭin* 56a), Nero became a proselyte, from whom the great Rabbi Meir was said to be descended.

KAMP (1515) comments on Beryllus (*Ant.* 20. 183), Nero's tutor, whom he identifies with Burrus, Nero's commander of the praetorian guard. But, we may comment, if Beryllus were the same as Burrus, the name would not, in all probability, have been spelled differently in *Antiquities* 20. 152 and in *Antiquities* 20. 183 so shortly afterwards; and we would be likely in the latter passage to get a cross-reference such as Josephus is fond of giving his readers.

PICARD (1516), commenting on *War* 2. 380–386, concludes that the situation described there, namely that Africa feeds the people of Rome, is possible only after the Emperor Nero took charge of the African grain supply when he confiscated the large estates there.

GRANT (1517), in a popular, readable, and lavishly illustrated book, presents a balanced picture of Nero in accordance with Josephus' statement that there were pro-Neronian accounts (*Ant.* 20. 154).

## 16: The War against the Romans

### 16.0: Josephus as a Source for the Great Jewish Revolt against the Romans (66–74 C.E.)

- (1518) WILHELM WEBER: *Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus.* Stuttgart 1921.
- (1519) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian.* New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (1520) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity.* London 1951; 2nd ed., 1957.
- (1521) ALAN LETTOFSKY: *The War of the Jews against the Romans according to Josephus and the Talmudic Sources* (in Hebrew). Senior Honors Thesis. Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. 1959.
- (1522) GODFREY R. DRIVER: *The Judaean Scrolls.* Oxford 1965.
- (1523) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135).* Vol. 1. Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Edinburgh 1973.
- (1524) PIERRE PRIGENT: *La fin de Jérusalem* (Archéologie biblique, 17). Neuchâtel 1969.
- (1525) CLEMENS THOMA: *Die Weltanschauung des Josephus Flavius. Dargestellt anhand seiner Schilderung des jüdischen Aufstandes gegen Rom (66–73).* In: *Kairos* 11, 1969, pp. 39–52.
- (1526) MENAHEM STEIN: *Josephus the Silent and Forgetful* (in Hebrew). In his: *The Relationship among Jewish, Greek, and Roman Cultures*, ed. JUDAH ROSENTHAL. Tel-Aviv 1970. Pp. 56–57.
- (1527) YITZHAK BAER: *Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.
- (1528) R. W. GARSON: *An Introduction to Josephus' Jewish War.* In: *Prudentia* 4. 1972, pp. 103–113.
- (1528a) KINJI HIDEMURA: *Revolts in Judaea* (in Japanese). In: *Sikaishi ni okeru asia* (= Asia in World History). Tokyo 1953. Pp. 25–35.
- (1528b) LEONHARD GOPPELT: *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert. Ein Aufriß der Urgeschichte der Kirche.* Gütersloh 1954.
- (1528c) ERNST LUDWIG EHRLICH: *Geschichte Israels von den Anfängen bis zur Zerstörung des Tempels (70 n. Chr.).* Berlin 1958. Trans. into English by JAMES BARR: *A Concise History of Israel: From the Earliest Times to the Destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70.* London 1962.
- (1528d) ROKUICHI SUGITA: *Judaean Revolution: A.D. 66–70* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1958.
- (1528e) GEDALYAHU ALON: *Rabbenu Johanan ben Zakkai's Removal to Jabneh.* In his: *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud.* Trans. from Hebrew by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 269–313.



(1528f) H. MULDER: *De verwoesting van Jerusalem en haar gevolgen*, Exegetica. Amsterdam 1977.

As an eyewitness of and even participant in many of the events of the great war which he described, Josephus, like his model Thucydides, was well equipped to write about it; but, despite his statement, traditional in prooemia, that previous accounts had been inaccurate or prejudiced or rhetorical, his own work has been rightly suspected on precisely these grounds. WEBER (1518) argues that Josephus derived most of his material from a 'Flavian' work, the theme of which was the rise of Vespasian and the Flavian dynasty.

THACKERAY (1519), pp. 37–41, objects that Josephus' sharp attack (War 1. 1–2) on his predecessors precludes his use of a literary source; but we may note that such objections were a rhetorical commonplace. THACKERAY himself thinks that Josephus' chief sources were the memoirs of Vespasian and of Titus, to which Josephus refers in his *Life* (342, 358) and in *Against Apion* (1. 50). But, we may comment, since Josephus was in an excellent position, as an insider, to observe the first part of the war, it would seem strange for him to rely upon the memoirs of outsiders, though, of course, he would have had to do so for the latter part of the war when he was no longer present on the scene.

BRANDON (1520) notes that Josephus' treatment of the role of the Samaritans, who were certainly numerous and must have played an important part one way or the other, is unusually brief, and he conjectures that they were coerced into an outward allegiance to the Jews; but, we may note, Josephus is unusually hostile toward the Samaritans, and if they had been involved in the revolt he would have mentioned this. As a matter of fact, at one point (War 3. 307–315) Josephus does mention that the Samaritans eagerly contemplated the prospect of revolt; but apparently their debacle on Mount Gerizim shortly after the beginning of the war chastened them.

LETTOFSKY (1521) has a collection of all references to the war in rabbinic sources, which he systematically compares with Josephus. He concludes that unlike Josephus' work, historical information in rabbinic sources is cloaked in legend, that both agree in noting that the cessation of the sacrifices for the emperor was the decisive step that led to the war, that both mention internal strife among the Jews and famine. But there are numerous disagreements: according to the rabbis the defeat was caused by the sins of the entire people, whereas according to Josephus it was extremists who were responsible (but, we may reply, in the Talmud, *Gittin* 56a, the extremists are severely condemned); the prophecy that Vespasian would attain the imperial throne made by Josephus himself is in rabbinic literature transferred to Joḥanan ben Zakkai; Josephus says that Titus opposed the burning of the Temple, whereas the rabbis agree with Sulpicius Severus in asserting that Titus favored the destruction; Josephus ignores mention of the courage of the Jewish captives, such as we find noted by the rabbis. Josephus, he contends, was writing for the Romans, whereas the rabbis wished to inspire the Jewish masses.

DRIVER (1522), pp. 237–238, wisely urges the reader to use caution in reading Josephus' account of the war since Josephus, a priest, was inclined to

sympathize with the priests, who, together with the Sadducean and Pharisaic leaders, were almost unanimously opposed to the revolt. The fact that he wrote his history for Greek and Roman readers increased his bias against all those who defied the Roman government; indeed, Josephus (War 3. 108) explicitly says that his purpose in writing his work is not only to console the vanquished but also to deter others (presumably, we may suggest, the sizable Jewish populations, estimated at a million each, of Babylonia, Syria, Egypt, and Asia Minor).

The revision of SCHÜRER (1523) notes that the 'War' is much more carefully composed than the 'Antiquities', that entering into the smallest detail Josephus provides an account the reliability of which, aside from the speeches and his figures, there is no reason to doubt, the sole exception being the account of his capture at Jotapata (War 3. 340–408). However, we may comment, while it is true that stylistically the 'War' is, indeed, superior to the 'Antiquities', presumably because of the help which Josephus received from his assistants, factually the 'Antiquities' represents an opportunity to correct the record.

PRIGENT (1524), in a popular, clear, and fascinatingly written survey of the wars of 66–70 and 132–135, contends that the archaeological discoveries, including the coins, confirm Josephus' account.

THOMA (1525) greatly downgrades Josephus' value as a source, noting that his opposition to the Jewish terrorists blatantly reveals his salvation-historical, theologizing partiality and that his ideology was permeated with Hellenism, Jewish wisdom literature, and apocalyptic traditions, the first of which may be discerned in his description of the Jewish sects and the latter two of which are particularly to be found in his version of the fall of Jerusalem. THOMA, however, surely oversimplifies when he contrasts the 'War' as pro-Roman propaganda with the 'Antiquities' as pro-Jewish: the latter was written in Rome, we must remember, where Josephus was still beholden to the Flavians.

STEIN (1526), commenting on Josephus' omissions, notes, in particular, that whereas Dio Cassius (66. 5. 4) states that many Romans went over to the side of the Jews during the war to help them fight for their freedom, Josephus omits this, presumably because it would be embarrassing to his Roman patrons.

BAER (1527), in a sharp attack on Josephus' credibility, says, basing himself on no direct evidence, that whereas in the 'Life' Josephus used his original contemporary notes, in the earlier 'War' he had distorted this material. Inasmuch as he was not present in Jerusalem during the siege, he must, says BAER, have followed the model of previous Greek historical writers, fitting Jerusalem into the framework of Athens, so that the high priests represent the democracy, while the Zealots are tyrants and John of Gischala in particular is the equivalent of Cleon. But, we may comment, Josephus' account is tendentious, sometimes to be corrected by the Talmud, as in the description of the election of the high priests; yet it is an error to confuse the influence of Greek historians on Josephus' style, notably in speeches, with the influence on his content. No doubt the oath of allegiance that John gave to the high priest Anan follows the formula of the oath given to Athenian citizens for the defense of their democracy, but this does not mean that no oath of allegiance was given. BAER contends that for the last days of the siege and fall of Jerusalem Josephus

and Tacitus used a common source written by a Roman military expert but which Josephus has distorted; but, we may remark, the one point of remarkable similarity is not in military details but in the description of the prodigies that accompanied the destruction of the Temple. BAER says that Josephus' account of the hatred, cruelty, and self-destruction in Jerusalem during the siege must be discounted as Josephus' tendentious invention; and when it is pointed out to him that similar tales are found in the Talmud (Giṭṭin 55b–56b), his fantastic reply, for which there is no evidence, is that the Talmudic tales are based on Josephus and on late Christian legends, including the tale of Joḥanan ben Zakkai's prediction of Vespasian's accession, which, he says, was derived by the Talmud from Josephus' account of himself, combined with material drawn from a military handbook on how to escape from a city under siege.

GARSON (1528) contends that Josephus, far from displaying the unbiased attitude which he professes in the introduction to the 'War', is so deeply involved personally and so full of self-contradiction and bias that his account must be approached with great caution.

I have not seen HIDEMURA (1528a).

GOPPELT (1528b), pp. 151–152, comments on the causes and the course of the Jewish War as reported by Josephus.

EHRlich (1528c), pp. 145–147, concludes that one cannot trust Josephus' narrative of the Jewish revolt in all its details.

I have not seen SUGITA (1528d); but GOHEI HATA, in a private communication, writes that this is the work of an amateur based on an uncritical use of Josephus' works in English translation.

ALON (1528e) stresses the inconceivable cruelty of the Romans towards the Jews. He argues that the Romans acted less cruelly only when they hoped thereby to obtain some benefit for themselves. From the outset, he contends, the Romans waged war not against a given movement of rebels within the Jewish nation but against the Jewish people as a whole, with the express purpose of depriving them of their political autonomy, of ending the rule of the Sanhedrin, and of destroying the nation physically and spiritually. We may argue that if this were so it would be a sharp departure from the overall policy toward the Jews from the days of the Persians through Alexander and the successor states and the Roman Republic. The fact that the Jewish people constantly appealed to the Roman Emperors, and usually with success, when they felt oppressed shows that the fundamental policy of the Roman government was one of tolerance toward the Jews. After all, the Romans were practical administrators and must have realized that to take a fundamentally negative stand toward a people comprising perhaps a tenth of the Roman Empire's population would be folly.

MULDER (1528f) presents a survey of the background of the Jewish war and its effect upon the Jews, Jewish Christians, Gentile Christians, and Romans. He has a brief discussion of the sources, including Josephus.

### 16.1: Chronology of Events of the War

(1528g) H. E. L. MELLERSH: *Chronology of the Ancient World, 10,000 B.C. to A.D. 799*. London 1976.

MELLERSH (1528g), pp. 300–301, 306, lists the major events of the war of 66–73 (i.e. 74), for which he is uncritically dependent upon Josephus. He has several questionable statements, notably that the Temple was destroyed despite Titus' efforts to preserve it, that Masada was occupied by Zealots, that it was invaded by the Romans under Titus in 73, and that the last of the garrison committed suicide.

### 16.2: The Coins as a Source for the Jewish War in General (see also 25.25)

(1529) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity*. London 1951; 2nd ed., 1957.

(1530) BARUCH KANAEL: 'The Historical Background of the Coins "Year Four . . . of the Redemption of Zion"'. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 129, Feb. 1953, pp. 18–20.

(1531) LEO KADMAN: *The Coins of the Jewish War of 66–73 C.E. (Corpus Nummorum Palaestinensium, 2nd ser. vol. 3)* Tel-Aviv 1960.

BRANDON (1529) notes that the importance of Eleazar ha-Cohen and of Simon (ben Gamaliel) Prince of Israel, which is clear in the coins, does not appear in Josephus' account, hence confirming our suspicion that Josephus is less than reliable in his account of what went on within beleaguered Jerusalem; but, we may comment, coins reflect an official position; and perhaps from that point of view Eleazar and Simon were important, though their influence *de facto* may have been much less.

KANAEL (1530) carefully notes that the inscriptions on the coins cast light on the difference between the factions of Simon bar Giora and John of Gischala. John's coins read: "Year Three of the freedom of Zion", hence indicating that his goal was merely political, whereas Simon's read "Year Four of the redemption of Zion", hence indicating the messianic goal of his faction. But, we may comment, while it is true that such a deduction fits in with the hints of the messianic aims of the rebellion mentioned by Tacitus (*Histories* 5. 13) and Suetonius (*Vespasian* 4) (and almost completely suppressed by Josephus, except for War 6. 312–315) and, we may add, the messianic aims of the other two great Jewish rebellions, those under Loukuas-Andreias in Trajan's reign and under Simon bar Kochba in Hadrian's reign, there is no evidence, we must state, that Simon claimed the Davidic descent required of a Messiah; and, indeed, his very name, Bar Giora, would indicate that he was the son of a proselyte and hence excluded.

KADMAN (1531), pp. 14–41, after presenting a summary of the historical background of the period, urges caution in using Josephus as a source of information about the fraternal strife in Jerusalem. He then presents a corpus of all extant coins issued by the revolutionaries, discusses the evidence for their

attribution, describes the types in detail, and co-ordinates the evidence with Josephus.

### 16.3: Numismatic Evidence for the Jewish War in Galilee (see also 25.25)

- (1532) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (1533) MORDECHAI NARKISS: *Coins of Palestine, I: Jewish Coins* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1936.
- (1534) HENRI SEYRIG: *Numismatic Chronicle*<sup>6</sup> 10, 1950, pp. 284–298.
- (1535) MORDECHAI NARKISS: *The Sepphorenes and Vespasian* (in Hebrew). In: *Yediot Ha-ḥevrah Le-ḥakirat Erez Yisrael* 17, 1953, pp. 108–120.
- (1536) HENRI SEYRIG: *Numismatic Chronicle*<sup>6</sup> 15, 1955, pp. 157–159.

COHEN (1532) has an excellent survey of the numismatic evidence, slight as it is, for the Galilean campaign of the Jewish War.

In a comedy of errors which COHEN summarizes, NARKISS (1533) had published two coins from Sepphoris in Galilee, one of which alludes to Vespasian. SEYRIG (1534) discusses the coins independently without seeing the reference to Vespasian. NARKISS (1535) defends his reading in another article, in which he notes that the coins confirm Josephus' frequent statements (*Life* 30, 38, 104, 124, 232, 346–348, 373–380, 394–396, 411; *War* 2. 511, 3. 20–34, 3. 59) that Sepphoris was strongly pro-Roman, since otherwise the city could hardly have been called 'City of Nero' and 'City of Peace', as it is indeed termed on the coins. SEYRIG (1536), still unaware of the existence of NARKISS, finally perceived the name of Vespasian on the coins. The fact that in several places in the 'War' (2. 574, 2. 629, 3. 61) the Sepphorenes are depicted as supporters of the revolution is thus disproved by the coins, according to COHEN. But, we must note, the coins represent an official attitude at a particular time; there may well have been revolutionary factions within Sepphoris at the times indicated by Josephus in the 'War'. In any case, two coins are hardly sufficient to prove, as COHEN would have it, that Sepphoris remained loyal to Rome throughout the war, since the 'War' has contradictory statements.

### 16.4: The Causes and Goals of the War

- (1537) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C. – A.D. 135). Vol. 1. Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Edinburgh 1973.
- (1538) MOSES ABERBACH: *The Roman-Jewish War (66–70 A.D.): Its Origin and Consequences*. London 1966.
- (1539) ELIYAHU STERN: *The Social Goals of the Great Revolution* (in Hebrew). In: *Mibbiphnim* 16, 1953, pp. 477–484.
- (1540) WILLIAM R. FARMER: *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*. New York 1956, 1963.
- (1541) CECIL ROTH: *The Debate on the Loyal Sacrifices, A.D. 66*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 53, 1960, pp. 93–97.

- (1542) CECIL ROTH: Simon bar Giora, Ancient Jewish Hero: A Historical Reinterpretation. In: Commentary 29, 1960, pp. 52–58.
- (1543) OTTO MICHEL: Simon bar Giora. In: Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies. Vol. 1. Jerusalem 1967. Pp. 77–80. Abstract in: Abstracts of Papers. Ancient Jewish History. The Hebrew University, Jerusalem. Pp. 17–18. Rpt. in his: Studien zu Josephus: Simon bar Giora. In: New Testament Studies 14, 1967–68, pp. 402–408.
- (1544) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: Josephus the Man and the Historian. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (1545) HEINZ KREISSIG: Die landwirtschaftliche Situation in Palästina vor dem jüdischen Krieg. In: Acta Antiqua 17, 1969, pp. 223–254.
- (1546) HEINZ KREISSIG: Die sozialen Zusammenhänge des jüdischen Krieges: Klassen und Klassenkampf in Palästina des 1. Jahrhunderts v. u. Z. Berlin 1970.
- (1547) JOHN GRAY: A History of Jerusalem. New York 1969.
- (1547a) HENRY WANSBROUGH: Suffered under Pontius Pilate. In: Scripture 18, 1966, pp. 84–93.
- (1547b) ERNEST L. ABEL: Jesus and the Cause of Jewish National Independence. In: Revue des Etudes juives 128, 1969, pp. 247–252.
- (1547c) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: The Struggle for the Soil and the Revolt of 66–73 C.E. (in Hebrew). In: Erez-Israel 12, 1975, pp. 125–128.
- (1547d) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: Judaea as a Roman Province; the Countryside as a Political and Economic Factor. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI und WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt 2. 8, 1977, pp. 355–396.
- (1547e) DAVID M. RHOADS: Israel in Revolution: 6–74 C.E.: A Political History Based on the Writings of Josephus. Philadelphia 1976.
- (1547f) URIEL RAPPAPORT: Notes on the Causes of the Great Revolt against Rome (in Hebrew). In: Cathedra 8, 1978, pp. 42–46.
- (1547g) CRANE BRINTON: The Anatomy of Revolution. New York 1938; rev. ed. 1952, 1965.
- (1547h) URIEL RAPPAPORT: The Relations between Jews and Non-Jews and the Great War against Rome (in Hebrew). In: Tarbiz 47, 1977–78, pp. 1–14.
- (1547i) LAWRENCE STONE: Theories of Revolution. In: World Politics 18, 1966, pp. 159–176.
- (1547j) HARRY JERRY KRANSEN: Social Organization Preceding the Destruction of the Second Temple. In: Hebrew Theological College Journal 1, Chicago 1954, pp. 54–66.
- (1547k) PETER A. BRUNT: Josephus on Social Conflicts in Roman Judaea. In: Klio 59, 1977, pp. 149–153.
- (1547l) PER BILDE: The Causes of the Jewish War according to Josephus. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism 10, 1979, pp. 179–202.

The revision of SCHÜRER (1537) correctly notes that Josephus neglected the Messianic goals of the revolution in order to conceal Jewish hostility to Rome; we may add that similarly in his treatment of Daniel he passes over the Messianic prophecies concerning the downfall of Rome.

ABERBACH (1538) emphasizes two sources of friction between Rome and Judaea — the gradual assumption of political power in Rome by anti-Jewish freedmen of Greek origin whose imperial ambitions could not tolerate a Jewish nation (comprising both Palestine and the Diaspora) within a nation, and the extraordinary success of Jewish missionary propaganda which threatened to undermine the spiritual foundations of the Empire. ABERBACH contends that the Roman attitude toward the Jews changed under Augustus because Herod had failed to Hellenize the Jews and had instead enhanced Judaism through the rebuilding of the Temple. He argues that the series of corrupt procurators could not have governed Judaea without the support of the central government. We

may comment, however, that there were a number of Roman administrators in Judaea and Syria, notably Petronius and Vitellius, after Augustus who showed consideration for the Jews, and that the successful intervention for the Jews by Agrippa I and II showed a reservoir of good will in Rome toward them. As to a Jewish nation within a nation, there is relatively little evidence, we may note, certainly during the three great rebellions against Rome (66–74, 115–117, 132–135 C.E.), that there was any co-ordination between the Jews of Palestine and those of the Diaspora. Moreover, though Josephus and the Talmud are well aware and proud of the success of Jewish proselytism, neither sees a connection between this factor and the revolt; nevertheless, Josephus implies that if the revolt had not taken place Judaism might have continued its spiritual conquest of the Roman world. Finally, Augustus' displeasure with Herod, at least according to Josephus, was due to his venturing on an unauthorized war against the Arabs. In any case, ABERBACH neglects internal factors in Judaea, especially economic, social, and political (messianic), as leading to the revolution.

STERN (1539), in a general sketch, concludes that Josephus is a prejudiced source.

FARMER (1540), in a thesis which, as noted above, has little hard evidence to support it, argues that the Jewish nationalists were not only counterparts of the Maccabees but that they deliberately modeled themselves upon them. He concludes that Josephus is not to be trusted in picturing the nationalists as transgressors of the Torah and of the Temple.

ROTH (1541) tries to reconstruct, but with no real evidence, the debate with regard to the proposal of Eleazar, captain of the Temple, who was the son of the high priest Ananias (War 2. 409), to discontinue the sacrifices which were offered daily in honor of the Emperor — an action which, according to Josephus, laid the foundation of the war with the Romans.

ROTH (1542), in a nationalistic outburst, repeats his generally justified attack on Josephus and praises the popular resistance movement against the Romans.

MICHEL (1543), in an attempt to reconstruct a balanced picture of Simon from Josephus' clearly prejudiced account, presents him not as a Hellenistic-Oriental tyrant such as emerges from Josephus but as an apocalyptic defender of divine justice who frees slaves. Josephus is guilty, contends MICHEL, of obscuring the Messianic element in Simon's program. In effect, we may comment, we may rehabilitate Simon, just as it is necessary to reconstruct the true Catiline in contrast to the blackened picture in Cicero; and, indeed, we may suggest that Josephus' portrait of Simon, no less than his of John of Gischala, as noted by THACKERAY (1544), pp. 119–120, is to some extent modeled on that of Catiline.

KREISSIG (1545) presents an analysis, through Marxist eyes, of the socio-economic situation, particularly with regard to ownership of land, in Palestine at the time of the outbreak of the war and concludes that the uprising was social in nature. KREISSIG (1546), continuing his Marxist interpretation, notes that the rabbis confirm Josephus in their contention that the Temple fell because of groundless hatred (Yoma 9b), because great and small were made equal (Shab-

bath 119b), and because there were twenty-four sects (Jerusalem Talmud, Shabbath 10. 5. 29b).

GRAY (1547), like most commentators, adopts Josephus' point of view in regarding the revolt against Rome as foolhardy. Thus (p. 168) Agrippa II emerges in a favorable light as a mediator between the Jews and Rome. Again he says that the Jewish revolutionaries were led on "by all manner of base and selfish motives" (p. 177). "The worst elements among the Jewish people", he adds (p. 179), were emerging as protagonists in the struggle against Rome. Again he speaks (p. 196) of the wholesome desire of the early Christians to be dissociated from the "blind chauvinism" of the fanatics who had come to dominate Judaism. But, we must retort, we have neither Justus of Tiberias' account nor that of any revolutionary. Josephus' own actions during the revolt render his account suspect, to say the least. Furthermore, one might well argue that these 'fanatics' really would have had a chance to attain an independent state, in view of the breakdown of the Roman principate during the Year of the Four Emperors, if they had co-ordinated their revolt with that of the Jews elsewhere (as was attempted under Trajan), or if they had similarly co-ordinated their revolt with those of other nations and especially the Parthians on the Roman frontier.

WANSBROUGH (1547a) asserts that it is not only Josephus' tendentiousness that makes him an inferior witness; in addition, Josephus' own sources were also highly partisan. WANSBROUGH, however, himself omits an extremely important cause for the outbreak of the war, namely the Messianic ferment in Palestine.

ABEL (1547b) notes that Tacitus (Hist. 5. 13), Suetonius (Vespasian 4), and Josephus (War 6. 285–287) all mention messianism as a contributing factor to the war; we may note, however, that none of them is explicit. A second factor was the Roman occupation of Judaea in 6, which led to a revolutionary movement. This movement was nationalistic and probably also messianic. It took an event of grave national import – the takeover of Palestine by the Romans in 6 – to combine nationalism and messianism. Against this background it is reasonable to suppose that some of his followers hoped that Jesus would lead a national movement against the Romans.

APPLEBAUM (1547c) stresses economic factors in the great revolt, noting that recent studies have not given sufficient weight to the problems of overpopulation and the restrictions on Jewish peasant holdings. He stresses that both the party going back to Hezekiah the father of Judah and that led by John of Gischala, though their origins were separated by more than a century, arose under similar circumstances, namely the struggle for land for cultivation. This struggle, quite naturally, arose on the periphery of Jewish settlement, where there was contact with the Gentile population, as we see in the conflict between the Jews and Greeks on the border of Peraea and Philadelphia under the procurator Cuspius Fadus. APPLEBAUM is properly critical of KREISSIG's (1545) Marxist analysis.

APPLEBAUM (1547d) surveys the agrarian factor in Judaea from the Hasmonean period to the revolution against Rome, regarding this as a key factor influencing the fate of the country. He concludes that there was a close connection between the origins of the Jewish activist movement which had begun in



Galilee in the middle of the first century B.C.E. and the struggle for soil that could be cultivated. The emergence of John of Gischala's group a century later was connected with the same problem. APPLEBAUM stresses the importance of land shortage, heavy taxation, and tenurial oppression.

RHOADS (1547e) concludes that each of the revolutionary groups had its own origin and history, and that many factors – religious, social, economic, and political – contributed to the internecine struggle among the revolutionaries. RHOADS concludes that the war was, for the most part, supported by the populace, but that Josephus may have been right that it was sedition, rather than the might of the enemy, which lost the war. He asserts that there is little evidence for the presence of a Jewish revolutionary sect in 6–44.

RAPPAPORT (1547f) stresses the sociological and psychological causes of the war, which, he says, was not so much between the Jews and the Romans as between the Jews and the non-Jews in the land of Israel. He believes, moreover, that the Emperor Caligula's attempt to introduce images into Jerusalem must have had a tremendous impact upon the revolutionaries, who were children at the time. We may, however, ask why, if indeed it was so traumatic, the revolutionaries do not refer to this event, as we may also ask why they do not stress the strife with the non-Jewish population of Palestine as a causative factor. A third factor was the participants' perception of the discrepancy between their value expectations and their value capabilities. RAPPAPORT notes that the revolution followed the pattern of revolutions outlined by BRINTON (1547g), notably in the burning of records of debts and in the freeing of slaves, though he stresses that the Jewish revolution differs from BRINTON's model in that it was primarily a conflict between Jews and non-Jews in Israel rather than a social conflict within the Jewish people.

RAPPAPORT (1547h), applying the general theories of STONE (1547i) concerning revolutions to the Jewish revolt, stresses the insoluble conflict between Jews and non-Jews, which he traces back to the Hasmonean period, as the major factor leading to the revolt. This was, he says, a trial bout; and once the Romans, who initially tried unsuccessfully to maintain the *status quo*, decided to support the Greeks, the revolt was inevitable. We may, however, comment that not only is this not stressed by Josephus, but even Tacitus, surely not the most sympathetic to the Jewish cause, does not highlight this, and indeed puts the blame largely on the procurators (Hist. 5.10). One guesses that RAPPAPORT has perhaps been unduly influenced by the contemporary scene, where indeed relations between Jews and their non-Jewish neighbors are truly a chief cause of tension.

I have not seen KRANSEN (1547j). [See *infra*, p. 930.]

BRUNT (1547k) stresses the contribution made by social tensions to the turmoil in Judaea. He concludes that upper-class Jews, for the most part, opposed the revolt because Rome preserved the social and economic *status quo*, and that the revolt was almost as much directed against native landlords and usurers as against the Roman rulers. Josephus, he says, emphasized this social conflict in order to convince Jews that the Roman victory was in their own best interests. Josephus, he believes, is a reliable source, as seen by the fact that occasionally he

criticizes the oppression of the Roman magistrates. BRUNT admits that Messianic delusions played a larger role than economic considerations in the conscious motivations of many of the actions. Very probably, he suggests, the peasants were not more opposed in Judaea than elsewhere, and yet it was only in Judaea that their discontent culminated in revolution. We may comment that Josephus hardly emphasizes the social conflict and that he explicitly blames the revolution on the political movement for independence generated by the Fourth Philosophy movement (Ant. 18. 4–10). As a lackey of the Romans, Josephus would have been expected to downplay the political causes if they had not been primary. As to the revolution breaking out in Judaea, we may comment that such uprisings, if history is a guide, generally do not begin in places where there is the greatest discontent but rather where there is a discontent in the fulfillment of rising expectations.

BILDE (15471) agrees with RAPPAPORT in stressing that Josephus had a major apologetical interest in blaming the revolution on Roman maladministration and on the Jewish hotheads. It is wrong to see Josephus' account as a justification of his own activities. Josephus' chief concern, as a historian, is in seeking the ultimate causes and consequences of the war. We may comment that BILDE's thesis is a case of *speculum principis*. This is what Josephus' chief concern as a historian should have been. If it had been thus it is hard to understand why Josephus spends so much time defending his work against detractors.

### 16.5: Babylonian Jewry and the War

(1547o) JACOB NEUSNER: The Jews East of the Euphrates and the Roman Empire. I. 1st–3rd Centuries A.D. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.9.1, 1976, pp. 46–69.

NEUSNER (1547o), pp. 52–55, ascribes the apparent indifference of Babylonian Jewry to the war to the fact that they could not have foreseen the destruction of the Temple. We may, however, ask how they could not have anticipated it, since it was surely the most important building in the most important city of Judaea and always became the prize of conquerors.

### 16.6: The Progress of the War

(1548) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: A Chronological Error on a Stamp of Israel. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 41, 1950–51, pp. 243–244.

(1549) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: The Defeat of Cestius Gallus, A.D. 66. In: *History Today* 20, 1970, pp. 38–46.

(1550) HEINZ KREISSIG: Die sozialen Zusammenhänge des jüdischen Krieges. Berlin 1970.

(1551) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Ph.D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.

(1552) HANS DREXLER: Untersuchungen zu Josephus und zur Geschichte des jüdischen Aufstandes 66–70. In: *Klio* 19, 1925, pp. 277–312.

- (1553) SALOMON (= SOLOMON) ZEITLIN: La révolution juive de 65–70, la révolution française et la révolution russe: étude comparative: communication faite à la convention de l'American Historical Association à Indianapolis, U.S.A. Paris 1930.
- (1554) CRANE BRINTON: The Anatomy of Revolution. New York 1938; revised, 1952, 1965.
- (1555) CECIL ROTH: The Jewish Revolt against Rome: The War of 66–70 C.E. In: Commentary 27, 1959, pp. 513–522.
- (1556) CECIL ROTH: The Background Story of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Year 70 C.E. In: Menorah Journal 48, 1960, pp. 41–49. Published also as: The Perpetual Pattern of Revolution. In: The Listener 64, Sept. 22, 1960, pp. 465–466.
- (1557) CECIL ROTH: The Constitution of the Jewish Republic of 66–70. In: Journal of Semitic Studies 9, 1964, pp. 295–319.
- (1558) D. S. BARRETT: Patterns of Jewish Submission and Rebellion in the Graeco-Roman World (unpublished paper presented at the Fourteenth Congress of the Australasian Universities' Languages and Literature Association, at University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand, Jan. 1972). Mimeographed, 24 pp.
- (1559) LAWRENCE STONE: Theories of Revolution. In: World Politics 18, 1966, pp. 159–176.
- (1560) JOSEPH DAOUST: La guerre juive selon Tacite. In: Bible et Terre Sainte 118, 1970, pp. 4–7.
- (1561) DAVID POLISH: Pharisaism and Political Sovereignty. In: Judaism 19, 1970, pp. 415–422.
- (1562) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: History of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). 5 vols. Jerusalem 1949; 2nd ed., 1951.
- (1563) JOSHUA LEVINSOHN: Galilee in the War of the Jews against the Romans (in Hebrew) (Israel Defense Army, Toledoth Erez Yisrael, 2). Tel-Aviv 1958.
- (1563a) DOUGLAS R. A. HARE: The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew (Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, 6). Cambridge 1967.
- (1563b) JACK FINEGAN: Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus; an Introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha and to some of the areas through which they were transmitted, namely, Jewish, Egyptian, and Gnostic Christianity, together with the earlier Gospel-type records in the Apocrypha, in Greek and Latin texts, translations and explanations. Philadelphia and Boston 1969.
- (1563c) WALTER WINK: Jesus and Revolution: Reflections on S. G. F. Brandon's *Jesus and the Zealots*. In: Union Seminary Quarterly Review 25, 1969, pp. 37–59.
- (1563d) JAY BRAVERMAN: Jerome as a Biblical Exegete in Relation to Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition as Seen in His *Commentary on Daniel*. Diss., Ph.D., Yeshiva University, New York 1970. Published as: *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 7). Washington 1978.
- (1563e) E. CONRAD: Victoria navalis. Vespasianus. In: Numismatic Circular 81.5, 1973, pp. 187–188.
- (1563f) BARBARA C. GRAY: The Movements of the Jerusalem Church during the First Jewish War. In: Journal of Ecclesiastical History 24, 1973, pp. 1–7.
- (1563g) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Gamla in Gaulanitis. In: Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins 92, 1976, pp. 54–71.
- (1563h) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Sēron and Cestius Gallus at Beith Ḥoron. In: Palestine Exploration Quarterly 108, 1976, pp. 13–21.
- (1563i) B. H. ISAAC and I. (YISROEL) ROLL: A Milestone of A.D. 69 from Judaea; the Elder Trajan and Vespasian. In: Journal of Roman Studies 66, 1976, pp. 15–19.
- (1563j) WILLIAM M. CHRISTIE: Palestine Calling. London 1940.
- (1563k) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Second Temple (332 B.C.–A.D. 70); Jews, Romans and Byzantines (70–640). In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, ed., *A History of the Holy Land*. Jerusalem, London, New York 1969. Pp. 109–184.

(1563l) GÖTZ SCHMITT: Zur Chronologie des Jüdischen Krieges. In: *Theokratia* 3, 1973–75, pp. 224–231.

ZEITLIN (1548), commenting on War 2. 284, which says that the war broke out in the month of Artemisius in the twelfth year of Nero's reign, argues that this was 4 June 65 C.E. rather than 66, as is universally accepted. Though Nero succeeded to the throne in October, 54, he says that the second year of his reign began on 10 December 54, the day that he obtained the tribunician power. But, we may comment, War 2. 284 also says that the war broke out in the seventeenth year of the reign of Agrippa II. Inasmuch as some of Agrippa's coins show that he reckoned his reign from the year 49/50, the war must have broken out in 66.

BRANDON (1549), in a popular article, notes that there is a manifest lacuna in Josephus' account of Cestius Gallus' operations. Josephus inexplicably says that Gallus suddenly recalled his troops, though he had not suffered a reverse and was, indeed, on the point of breaking into the Temple. But, we may note, Gallus may simply have been cautious in view of the hard fighting which he had already experienced from the die-hards.

KREISSIG (1550) claims that after the defeat of Cestius, the nobles (War 2. 562–568) did not usurp control from anyone because they opposed the Zealots and were the peace party. But, as COHEN (1551) rightly remarks, KREISSIG's theory is a bold rejection of everything that the 'War' and the 'Life' say about Ananus in Jerusalem.

COHEN (1551), who presents a detailed attempt to reconstruct the early days of the war, generally follows DREXLER (1552) in his skeptical attitude toward Josephus' narrative. He argues that it is implausible that extremists would voluntarily relinquish power to a group of aristocrats who had not participated in the preceding events and therefore assumes that the priestly party had participated in the fighting against Cestius. He concludes that we really know very little about the war, particularly with regard to the organization of the revolutionary government and the description of individual characters.

ZEITLIN (1553), anticipating the theme of BRINTON (1554) that all revolutions follow predictable patterns, compares the course of the Jewish revolution against Rome with the French and Russian revolutions.

This same theme is developed by ROTH (1555) in a highly nationalistic article completely unsympathetic to Josephus, the substance of which he later reproduced (1556). ROTH, who compares the Jewish uprising with the Puritan, American, French, and Russian revolutions, concludes that the sequence of events in Judaea followed closely the normal pattern of revolution as described by BRINTON: 1) a reformist movement; 2) a stage where truly revolutionary, popular leaders assumed control; 3) a social revolutionary movement; 4) a reign of terror; and 5) a dictatorship.

ROTH (1557), tracing the course of the government of the briefly independent Jewish state, says that at first authority came from the assembly of the people in Jerusalem, the distinguished men of the Sanhedrin, and the high priestly families, that only in the course of time did military leaders assume dictatorial power while respecting, at least nominally, the high priest, and that it

did not degenerate even in its last days to mob-rule; but ROTH, we must comment, is almost totally dependent upon Josephus, whose sources for what went on within Jerusalem are surely fragmentary and prejudiced. Moreover, ROTH's study is predicated on the premise that Josephus uses his Greek terms consistently and precisely, whereas ROTH himself (pp. 307, 313 n. 4) admits that this premise is false.

A more sophisticated treatment of the same problem of patterns in revolutions, particularly in causation, as applied to the Maccabean revolt and the three uprisings against Rome (66–70, 115–117, 132–135), has been written by BARRETT (1558). In particular, he rightly stresses the role of leadership in analyzing both the successes and failures of these revolutions and, following STONE (1559), distinguishes between preconditions and 'trigger' factors. He is to be commended for noting not only the many instances where the revolutions follow BRINTON's pattern but also where they deviate from it.

DAOUST (1560), in a popular article, has a selection of passages from Tacitus, whom he compares with Josephus, illustrating the beginnings of the war and the capture of Jerusalem by Titus.

POLISH (1561) objects to KLAUSNER's (1562) view that the revolt failed because of disunity in the ranks of the revolutionaries and agrees with Josephus that a less militant policy by a united people might have spared them disaster.

LEVINSOHN (1563) presents a brief, popular, military history.

HARE (1563a), p. 37, concludes that there is good reason for believing that the flight of Jewish Christians to the Gentile city of Pella beyond the Jordan was induced by persecution. Josephus, he says, provides ample material for a demonstration of the chaotic situation in Palestine during these troubled years and for dispensing with the right of a trial (Life 136, 177).

FINEGAN (1563b), pp. 49–50, deals with the alleged Christian departure for Pella at the beginning of the war in the light of War 2. 458.

WINK (1563c) cites War 2. 556 in an effort to demonstrate that the Christians did escape from Jerusalem, since after the defeat of the Roman governor Cestius Gallus many distinguished Jews abandoned Jerusalem, "as swimmers desert a sinking ship".

BRAVERMAN (1563d), pp. 225–226 (printed version, p. 106), notes that according to Jerome's Commentary on Daniel 6. 24–27, Vespasian and Titus concluded peace with the Jews for three years and six months, a fact that is not mentioned by Josephus. Similarly, the Jewish commentator Ibn Ezra on Daniel 9. 24 says that Titus made a covenant with Israel for seven years and that during this period, according to Josippon, after three and a half years, the daily sacrifice was nullified. We may comment that perhaps Josippon is here reflecting a text that was in Josephus but is now lost, or perhaps Jerome is paraphrasing from memory, and he has confused this with the three and a half years during which the sacrifice ceased under Antiochus (War 1. 32); or perhaps he is referring to the passage in War 5. 394 that the sanctuary lay desolate for three and a half years.

CONRAD (1563e) refers to the naval battle in the Sea of Galilee (War 3. 522–531) during which the Jewish fleet was destroyed by Vespasian.

GRAY (1563f), in attempting to establish the thesis that the members of the Jerusalem church moved to Pella during the course of the war, cites Josephus (Ant. 20. 256) as evidence that it was possible to get out of the city in various ways. We may, however, comment on the difficulty that Johanan ben Zakkai experienced and on the fact that he finally had to escape in a coffin. To be sure, however, Pella (War 2. 458) was not pro-nationalist and hence was not hostile to those fleeing.

BAR-KOCHVA (1563g), examining Vespasian's invasion of the Shefela and the Judaeen hills, suggests that Josephus has described only part of the campaigns in the 'War', that the campaign in Gaulanitis and the invasion of Judaea occurred before Josephus was allowed to move freely, and that therefore the narrative after the fall of Jotapata is not as comprehensive as that of the siege of Jerusalem. We may, however, comment that perhaps the reason why Josephus described the siege of Jerusalem at much greater length was that he was convinced, probably rightly, that it was by far the most decisive event of the war.

BAR-KOCHVA (1563h) analyzes militarily the blockade of the descent at Beith Horon by a Jewish force opposing Cestius Gallus, the Roman governor of Syria, in 66 (War 2. 499–555). Josephus' description of the trap set by Cestius Gallus is confirmed by many topographical details, which, we may assume, accord with the topography of the ascent. If, says BAR-KOCHVA, far-distant Masada was described so precisely by Josephus, the ascent at Beith Horon, the main road to Jerusalem (War 2. 228), which he must have traveled more than once, would certainly be accurately described. We may, however, comment that perhaps the reason why Josephus is relatively accurate in his description of Masada is that he had better sources. BAR-KOCHVA agrees with Nero (War 3. 1–2) that the carelessness of commanders rather than the bravery of the enemy was chiefly responsible for the disaster.

ISAAC and ROLL (1563i) note that according to Josephus (War 3. 141–142, 3. 118), the Roman army in Judaea included special units whose task it was to strengthen and broaden existing roads, and that the date of a milestone from Afula indicates that at least one new road was constructed during the Jewish War. They comment on the discovery of a milestone which sheds light on the activities of the elder Trajan as commander of the Tenth Legion in Judaea under Vespasian (War 3. 289ff., 458, 485; 4. 450).

I have not seen CHRISTIE (1563j). [See *infra*, p. 931.]

AVI-YONAH (1563k) comments, as an archaeologist, on the relatively small amount of national damage, apart from that at Jerusalem, Jotapata, and Gamala (and Masada, we should add), caused by the war, a fact which, he says, helped greatly in the task of reconstruction of national life. We may remark that the main reason for this was not that the Romans showed so much restraint but rather that the revolutionaries staked their all on the defense of Jerusalem after the initial speedy loss of Galilee.

SCHMITT (1563l) notes that Tacitus (Hist. 5. 10) knows nothing of a campaign in 69, that it does not seem likely that Vespasian would have waited a year after the completion of the campaign at Jericho, and that therefore the events described in War 4. 550–555 belong to the year 68, rather than to 69.

## 16.7: The Siege of Jerusalem

- (1564) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: *Topographie du siège de Jérusalem en 70*. In: *Revue Biblique* 56, 1949, pp. 238–258.
- (1565) ROBERT H. WILLETS: *The Causes, Culmination, and Consequences of the Destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.* Diss., Ph.D., Southern Baptist Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky 1949.
- (1566) ARTHUR STEIN: *Die Präfecten von Ägypten in der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Bern 1950.
- (1567) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *The Wall of Agrippa and Titus' Siege* (in Hebrew). In: MICHAEL ISH-SHALOM, MEIR BENAYAHU, AZRIEL SHOCHAT, edd., *Jerusalem* 1953. Pp. 40–42.
- (1568) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Fall of Jerusalem A.D. 70*. In: *History Today* 8, 1958, pp. 248–255. Rpt. in his: *Religion in Ancient History. Studies in Ideas, Men, and Events*. New York 1969. Pp. 268–281.
- (1569) VALENTINO CAPOCCI: *Christiana, I: Per il testo di Annales 15, 44, 4 (sulle pene inflitte ai Cristiani nel 64 d. Cr.)*. In: *Studia et Documenta Historiae et Iuris* 28, 1962, pp. 65–99.
- (1570) JACOB NEUSNER: *A Life of Rabban Yohanan Ben Zakkai, Ca. 1–80 C.E.* (Studia Post-Biblica, 6). Leiden 1962; 2nd ed., 1970.
- (1571) ALEXANDER SCHEIBER: *Zu den antiken Zusammenhängen der Aggada*. In: *Acta Antiqua* 13, 1965, pp. 267–272.
- (1572) NAOMI G. COHEN: *The Theological Stratum of the Martha b. Boethus Tradition: An Explication of the Text in Gittin 56a*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 69, 1976, pp. 187–195.
- (1573) CLEMENS THOMA: *Die Zerstörung des jerusalemischen Tempels im Jahre 70 n. Chr. Geistig-religiöse Bedeutung für Judentum und Christentum nach den Aussagen jüdischer und christlicher Primärliteratur*. Diss., Wien 1966.
- (1574) CHAIM RAPHAEL: *The Walls of Jerusalem*. New York 1968.
- (1575) *La distruzione di Gerusalemme del 70 nei suoi riflessi storico-letterari (= Atti del V Convegno biblico-francescano Roma 22–27 Sett. 1969: Collectio Assisiensis 8)*. (Studio Teologico 'Porziuncola'). Assisi 1971.
- (1576) YITZHAK BAER: *Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.
- (1577) GÉRARD ISRAËL and JACQUES LEBAR: *Quand Jérusalem brûlait en l'an 70, le 29 août*. (Collection ce jour-là). Paris 1970. Trans. into English by ALAN KENDALL: *When Jerusalem Burned*. New York 1973.
- (1578) RUPERT FURNEAUX: *The Roman Siege of Jerusalem*. New York 1972; London 1973.
- (1579) A. MERTENS: *O assédio de Jerusalém por Tito no ano 70 d. C.* In: *Revista de Cultura Biblica* (São Paulo) 9, 1972, pp. 135–146.
- (1579a) A. MERTENS: *L'assédio di Gerusalemme a opera di Tito nel 70 D.C.* In: *Bibbia e Oriente* 12, 1970, pp. 264–272.
- (1579b) KINJI HIDEMURA: *Ierusalem kanraku (A.D. 70) (Fall of Jerusalem: A.D. 70)* (in Japanese). In his: *Seiyo shiryō shusei (An Assemblage of Western History Sources)*. Tokyo 1956. P. 145.
- (1579c) KARL G. KUHN: *Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften, 33: Bericht über neue Qumranfunde und über die Öffnung der Kupferrollen*. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 81, 1956, pp. 541–546.

ABEL (1564), following Josephus closely as a guide, uses the results of archaeology to discuss the topography of Jerusalem and its defenses.

I have not seen WILLETS (1565).

STEIN (1566) argues that Josephus (War 5. 45) is wrong in saying that Tiberius Julius Alexander accompanied Titus to Jerusalem, since an inscription shows that shortly before he had been succeeded as prefect of Egypt by Liternius Fronto, and that it was consequently Fronto who accompanied Titus. He therefore suggests emending Ἀτέριος, who is said to have come with two legions from Alexandria, to Λιτέρνιος. The proposed emendation is, indeed, a sound one, but STEIN has misread War 5. 45, which says that Tiberius Alexander, πρότερον ("previously") in charge of Egypt, accompanied Titus. This can definitely be reconciled with the apparent fact that he was no longer prefect of Egypt.

AVI-YONAH (1567) suggests that the reason why Titus, in the events described in 'War', Books 5 and 6, attacked Jerusalem first from the west and not, as had other attackers, from the north, was that the wall of Agrippa was then strong in the north but weak in the west.

BRANDON (1568) presents a vivid description in a popular lecture.

CAPOCCI (1569) uses Seneca and Josephus (War 5. 449, which describes the torture of Jewish prisoners by Titus during the siege of Jerusalem) to determine the reading of Tacitus (Annals 15. 44. 4, describing the torture inflicted upon the Christians by Nero).

NEUSNER (1570), p. 39, comments on the omens (War 6. 293–294) predicting the destruction of the Temple, as paralleled by the account in the Talmud (Yoma 39b), which, he says, was intended to provide a Pharisaic recension of the event. He conjectures (p. 166) that almost everyone in the court of Gamaliel II had either fled Jerusalem during the early stages of the war or had been absent from the very beginning.

SCHEIBER (1571) says that there is no reason to doubt Josephus' account (War 6. 199–212) of how a certain wealthy woman named Mary ate her own son during the famine which beset Jerusalem during the siege, though he suggests that Josephus dressed up the scene, perhaps bearing in mind a similar act of cannibalism in Petronius.

COHEN (1572), noting a parallel between Mary and Martha, a rich lady in Jerusalem who found her wealth useless during the famine, argues that considerations of friendship and self-interest affected Josephus' choice of material (War 6. 201ff.), and that the context in which he cites it transformed information objectively accurate in itself into tendentious propaganda.

I have not seen THOMA (1573).

RAPHAEL (1574) presents a vivid, popular summary of the siege and destruction of Jerusalem, drawing upon Josephus and the Midrash.

I have not seen the proceedings of the Biblical Franciscan Congress (1575).

BAER (1576) discounts Josephus' horror tales about Jerusalem during the siege; but, we may comment, they are supported by the Talmud (Giṭṭin 55b–56b).

ISRAËL and LEBAR (1577) have a romanticized, popular account of the year 70.

FURNEAUX (1578) has written an account in a very popular style and includes a survey of Jewish history from 6 to 70.



MERTENS (1579)(1579a), drawing upon Josephus and the findings of archaeology, presents a summary of the siege of Jerusalem, stressing the internal dissension in the city prior to the siege. In particular, he discusses the reliefs on the Arch of Titus.

I have not seen HIDEMURA (1579b).

KUHN (1579c) concludes that it is very likely that before the siege of the Temple, the Temple treasures were removed outside Jerusalem to a secret hideaway, so that Josephus himself did not know of it. But, we may remark, this seems unlikely, since he was a priest. KUHN cites parallels between the Copper Scroll, which, like Josephus (War 6. 387–391), speaks of a hiding-place. Josephus also speaks of an underground hiding-place of treasures (War 6. 429–432).

## 16.8: The Burning of the Temple

- (1580) JAKOB BERNAYS: Ueber die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus. Berlin 1861. Rpt. in his: *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, ed. HERMANN K. USENER. Vol. 2. Berlin 1885. Pp. 81–200.
- (1581) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 2, *The Jewish War*, Books I–III (Loeb Classical Library). London 1927.
- (1582) WILHELM WEBER: Josephus und Vespasian: Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus. Stuttgart 1921.
- (1583) EMIL SCHÜRER: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Vol. 1. 3rd ed., Leipzig 1901.
- (1584) I. M. J. VALETON: De Bedoelingen van Keizer Vespasianus omtrent Jeruzalem en den Tempel Tijdens het Beleg. Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen. Afdeling Letterkunde. Vierde Reeks. Deerde Deel. Amsterdam 1899. Pp. 87–116.
- (1585) ANNA M. A. HOSPERS-JANSEN: Tacitus over de Joden: Hist. 5, 2–13. Diss. phil., Utrecht 1949 (Dutch, with extensive English summary).
- (1586) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*, Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973.
- (1587) GEDALIAH ALLON (GEDALYAHU ALON): The Burning of the Temple (in Hebrew). In: *Yavneh (Jerusalem) 1, 1939*, pp. 85–106. Reprinted in his: *Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple, the Mishnah and the Talmud*. Vol. 1. Tel-Aviv 1957, 2nd. ed. 1967. Pp. 206–218. Trans. into English by ISRAEL ABRAHAM: *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 252–268.
- (1588) JOHANAN (HANS) LEWY: The Motives of Titus to Destroy the Temple according to Tacitus (in Hebrew). Appendix A in his: *The Words of Tacitus on the Antiquities of the Jews and Their Qualities*. In: *Zion 8, 1942–43*, pp. 81–83. Rpt. in his: *Studies in Jewish Hellenism*. Jerusalem 1969. Pp. 190–194.
- (1589) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: The Personality of Flavius Josephus in the Light of His Account of the Burning of the Temple (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron 7, 1942–43*, pp. 290–299.
- (1590) LEON GRY: La ruine du Temple par Titus: Quelques traditions juives plus anciennes et primitives à la Base de Pesikta Rabbathi XXVI. In: *Revue Biblique 55, 1948*, pp. 215–226.

- (1591) HUGH MONTEFIORE: Sulpicius Severus and Titus' Council of War. In: *Historia* 11, 1962, pp. 156–170.
- (1592) INGOMAR WEILER: Titus und die Zerstörung des Tempels von Jerusalem – Absicht oder Zufall? In: *Klio* 50, 1968, pp. 139–158.
- (1593) MENAHEM STERN: Flaccus, Valerius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 6, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1333–1334.
- (1594) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Orosius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 12, Jerusalem 1971, p. 1477.
- (1594a) TIMOTHY D. BARNES: The Fragments of Tacitus' *Histories*. In: *Classical Philology* 72, 1977, pp. 224–231.
- (1594b) G. K. VAN ANDEL: The Christian Concept of History in the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus. Amsterdam 1976.

According to Josephus (War 6. 241), Titus, in the council that he held with his staff prior to the attack on Jerusalem, urged that the Temple be spared. BERNAYS (1580), noting that in the 'Chronica' (2. 30. 6–7) of Sulpicius Severus, a fourth-century Christian historian, Titus demands the destruction of the Temple in order to crush Judaism as well as Christianity, which had its origins there, suggests that Sulpicius copied his information verbatim from a lost portion of Tacitus' 'Histories', which, in turn, was derived from a lost work of M. Antonius Julianus, who is apparently identical with the procurator of Judaea in 70 and was one of those present at Titus' council (War 6. 238) and wrote a work 'De Iudaeis'; indeed Minucius Felix (Octavian 33. 4) suggests that Josephus' account be compared with that of Antonius. The statement, we may reply, that Sulpicius copied from Tacitus cannot be proven, since in the extant account of Titus' siege of Jerusalem in the 'Histories' Titus' role in the burning of the Temple is not mentioned; but inasmuch as Tacitus (Histories 5. 2) states that he will relate the last days of Jerusalem and does not do so in the portion of the 'Histories' which is extant, we may suppose that he raised the topic at another point which is lost. The assertion in Sulpicius that Titus urged the destruction of the Temple in order to destroy both Judaism and Christianity sounds tendentious, though THACKERAY (1581), p. xxv, notes EISLER's (oral) suggestion that *Christiani* in Sulpicius may be a general designation for Jewish "Messianist" rebels; he declines, without stating a reason, to follow him, but we may note that in a period as late as the time of Sulpicius in the fourth century the term *Christiani* can hardly have any meaning other than "Christians". Yet one is suspicious that Josephus misrepresented the attitude of Titus in order to make him appear a man of clemency. Most scholars, such as WEBER (1582), pp. 72–73, prefer Sulpicius. SCHÜRER (1583) follows VALETON (1584) in concluding that Josephus has not actually falsified the account but that by suppressing important facts he has created a misleading impression.

BERNAYS's hypothesis that Tacitus derived his information from a lost work of Antonius Julianus is unproven, as HOSPERS-JANSEN (1585) indicates. As the revised edition of SCHÜRER (1586), pp. 33–34, reminds us, Josephus himself (War 1. 1) says that the war did not lack its historians, and any of them, we may suggest, might have been the ultimate source of the tradition embodied in Sulpicius Severus.

ALLON (1587) convincingly argues that Titus gave the order to destroy the Temple, noting that the Talmud is unanimous in blaming him. He remarks,

moreover, that Josephus himself states in Agrippa II's speech before the war (War 2. 400) that the Romans will not spare the Temple if the Jews revolt; but, we may comment, this was said to deter the Jews: there is no indication that Titus would order the Temple to be burnt. Similarly, we may remark, the statement (Ant. 20. 123) cited by ALLON in which the Jewish leaders in Jerusalem during the procuratorship of Cumanus urged the Jews not to revolt since their Temple would be consigned to the flames if they did is rhetoric designed to deter them, not an indication that Titus gave such an order.

ALLON notes that Josephus contradicts himself, since in War 7. 1 he says explicitly that it was Titus who ordered the whole city and the Temple to be razed, whereas in Antiquities 20. 250 he declares that Titus captured and set fire to the city and to the Temple. ALLON argues that there is enough internal evidence in Josephus to prove that Titus intended to destroy not only the Temple but also the Jews as a nation. He notes that Titus deliberately executed all the priests (War 6. 322), gave his troops permission to burn and sack Jerusalem (War 6. 353), and failed to punish any of his soldiers who indiscriminately killed whomever they encountered (War 6. 404). Moreover, three days prior to the burning of the Temple, Titus (War 4. 1) had ordered the gates to be set on fire when he saw that his leniency had resulted in death for his soldiers. WEILER (1592) has independently analyzed these contradictions and has reached conclusions similar to ALLON's, but ALLON disagrees with WEILER's theory that Josephus produced a new version of the 'War' in 75 because Titus wanted to impress the Jewish king Agrippa and his sister Berenice, who visited Rome in that year, with the fact that the Temple had been destroyed despite his orders, and that Josephus was eager to please his master, Titus. ALLON notes that his view that Titus did order the Temple to be burned is supported by the Talmud (Giṭṭin 56b and parallels) and Dio Cassius (6. 65).

LEWY (1588) agrees with BERNAYS that Josephus' account is deliberately falsified and notes that Josephus himself (War 6. 339) hints that Titus saw the need to extirpate the worship in Jerusalem. He says that Sulpicius Severus' statement that Titus favored the destruction of the Temple accords with Tacitus' view that the destruction of the anti-divinity Temple was an appropriate punishment in view of the Jews' anti-divinity beginnings, as Tacitus relates them (Hist. 5. 3-5).

URBACH (1589) similarly attacks Josephus' account.

GRY (1590), though noting some agreements between Josephus' version and that of the Pesikta Rabbati and the Syriac Baruch in their accounts of the destruction of the Temple, concludes that Josephus gives us the Roman version of events while the Pesikta gives the Jewish version in apocalyptic language. But, we may comment, the Pesikta is here discussing the burning of the First Temple, not the second, which Titus destroyed.

MONTEFIORE (1591) presents the sophistic but unconvincing solution that Josephus is closer to the actual words that Titus spoke but that Sulpicius portrays the real intent behind the words. He does, however, establish that Sulpicius did not follow Tacitus, who records that only 600,000 men, women, and children were involved in the siege of Jerusalem (perhaps, we may guess, to

make it accord with the Biblical number of men who made the exodus from Egypt), since Sulpicius says that 100,000 were killed and 1,100,000 were taken captive, approximately the figures found in Josephus. MONTEFIORE suggests that it is most likely that Antonius Julianus was the source for the view that Titus favored the destruction of the Temple.

WEILER (1592), after examining the relevant passages in Pliny the Elder, Valerius Flaccus, Dio Cassius, Sulpicius Severus, Orosius, and rabbinic writings, convincingly casts doubt on Josephus' version. Particularly cogent is the poem to Valerius Flaccus, a contemporary of Josephus, who refers to Titus' conquest of Jerusalem "as he hurls the brands and spreads havoc in every tower". To be sure, as STERN (1593) points out, Valerius refers generally to Jerusalem and not specifically to the Temple, but since the Temple was, by far, the most prominent building in Jerusalem, one may guess that it is included in Valerius' picture of the vehemence with which Titus set fire to the city. Orosius, too, as I (1594) have remarked, like Sulpicius, definitely knew Josephus, yet, like Sulpicius and unlike Josephus, he states that Titus gave the word to set fire to the Temple. All in all, the evidence against Josephus' version is strong.

BARNES (1594a) concludes that Sulpicius Severus, in his *Chronica* 2. 30, was using a lost portion of Tacitus, 'Histories', Book 5, in his account of the capture of Jerusalem, according to which Titus adopted a deliberate policy of destruction, in contrast to Josephus' version. To support his position he notes that Severus had already employed Tacitus in the immediately preceding chapter, that Orosius (*Historia adversus paganos* 7. 9. 4–6) has a very similar account which most probably also came from Tacitus, and that Severus reproduces Tacitean vocabulary, particularly in its echoes of Sallust.

VAN ANDEL (1594b) says that BERNAYS (1580) is correct in regarding Tacitus as Severus' source and that VALETON (1584) is right in noting that Severus' data as to the number of Jews slain and taken captive in the war agree with Josephus. His solution is to declare that Severus drew upon Eusebius/Jerome, who had access to both Tacitus and Josephus. In any case, Severus' account of the attitude of the Romans and Jews toward each other corresponds to what Tacitus says in *Histories* 5. 11 and 13.

### 16.9: The Population of Palestine and of Jerusalem in Particular in the First Century

- (1595) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu. Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*. Leipzig 1923; 3rd ed., Göttingen 1962. Trans. into French (based on 3rd ed.) by JEAN LEMOYNE: *Jérusalem au temps de Jésus, recherches d'histoire économique et sociale pour la période néotestamentaire*. Paris 1967. Trans. into English (based on 3rd ed.) by F. H. and C. H. CAVE: *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus; An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Philadelphia 1969.
- (1596) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: *Die Einwohnerzahl Jerusalems zur Zeit Jesu*. In: *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 66, 1943, pp. 24–31. Reprinted in his: *Abba*. Göttingen 1966. Pp. 335–341.

- (1597) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: How Many Jews Will Be Able to Live in Palestine? Based on an Analysis of the Jewish Population in Palestine in the Days of the Second Temple. In: *Jewish Social Studies* 11, 1949, pp. 119–128.
- (1598) JUDAH ROSENTHAL: Problems in the History of the Jews in the Period of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: MENAHEM RIBALOW, ed., *Sefer ha-Shanah li-Yihude Amerika* (Annual of the Jews of America). Vols. 10–11. New York 1949. Pp. 316–334.
- (1599) ANTHONY BYATT: Josephus and Population Numbers in First Century Palestine. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 105, 1973, pp. 51–60.
- (1599a) JOHN WILKINSON: Ancient Jerusalem; Its Water Supply and Population. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 106, 1974, pp. 33–51.
- (1599b) MAGEN BROSHI: La population de l'ancienne Jérusalem. In: *Revue Biblique* 82, 1975, pp. 5–14.
- (1599c) MAGEN BROSHI: Estimating the Population of Ancient Jerusalem. In: *Biblical Archaeology Review* 4.2, June 1978, pp. 10–15.
- (1599d) LEO REALBERG: Institutions of Self-Government of Palestinian Jewry and Their Demographic Concomitants, 141 B.C.E. – 217 C.E. Diss., Ph.D., New York University, New York 1975.
- (1599e) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Holy Land from the Persian to the Arab Conquests (536 B.C. to A.D. 640). A Historical Geography. Grand Rapids 1966.
- (1599f) ERIC MEYERS and JAMES F. STRANGE: Survey in Galilee, 1976. In: *Explor* 3, 1977, pp. 7–17.
- (1599g) SHIMON DOR: The Settlements of the Hermon in the Period of the Mishnah and the Talmud (in Hebrew). In: SHIMON APPLEBAUM, ed., *The Hermon and Its Foothills*. Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 151–157.
- (1599h) JOHN D. WILKINSON: Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It: Archaeology as Evidence. London, New York 1978.
- (1599i) CHESTER C. McCOWN: The Density of Population in Ancient Palestine. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 66, 1947, pp. 425–436.

JEREMIAS (1595) is particularly skeptical of Josephus' figures for those trapped in Jerusalem during the siege (War 6. 420).

JEREMIAS (1596), commenting on War 2. 280, 6. 420ff., and Against Apion 1. 197, asserts that Josephus, like the Talmud, vastly exaggerates the Jewish population of Jerusalem, and that the actual number of inhabitants was between 25,000 and 30,000.

KLAUSNER (1597), in a highly nationalistic article which clearly seeks to establish that Palestine can accommodate far more people than were living in that land in 1949, admits that Josephus greatly exaggerated (War 2. 280) when he writes that Cestius Gallus was surrounded by 3,000,000 Jews, and that this number actually represents the total population of Palestine. He accepts the number of Jews killed in the war as 1,100,000 and of prisoners as 97,000 (War 6. 420). As to the latter figure, we may comment that, strangely enough, Josephus' presumed contemporary, Pseudo-Philo (*Biblical Antiquities* 31. 2), says that of the army of Sisera in the war against the Judge Deborah there were slain ninety times 97,000 men. Such a figure is not a round number, and we may guess that this is the actual number of those taken prisoner by the Romans.

ROSENTHAL (1598) believes that when Josephus says that there were three million or more Jews resident in Galilee he is exaggerating. He suggests, without

offering any new evidence, that the total Jewish population of Palestine at this time was only about one million.

BYATT (1599) casts doubt on Josephus' statement (War 3. 43) that even the smallest village in Galilee contained more than 15,000 inhabitants but says that in general Josephus is self-consistent. BYATT estimates, that the total population of first-century Palestine was approximately 2,265,000 and that the population of Greater Jerusalem was 220,000, but that at the time of the three pilgrimage festivals, when large numbers of Jews from other areas came to Jerusalem, the population would swell to over a million. Josephus' figure of 2,556,000 in War 6. 422–426 for Jerusalem he deems unreasonable.

WILKINSON (1599a), using as evidence Josephus' mention of rain-collecting pools, examines Jerusalem's growth of population in the light of the development of its water system.

BROSHI (1599b) (1599c), however, rightly objects to WILKINSON's arbitrary figure of twenty liters of water consumption per person per day. BROSHI (1599b) estimates the size of Jerusalem on the basis of archaeology, noting the co-efficient of urban density for various periods in Jewish history from David to the destruction of the Second Temple. He estimates that the population at the time of Alexander the Great was 4,800, that at the time of Alexander Jannaeus it was 32,000, that it was 40,000 at the time of Herod, and that at the time of the destruction of the Temple by the Romans it was 82,500. Thus he concludes that the estimates of Josephus, who says that the population was 120,000 at the beginning of the third century B.C.E., and of modern scholars are much too high. We may, however, comment that density of population is extremely difficult to measure, and, in any case, was hardly, though the ages, as constant as BROSHI assumes. His assumption that Jerusalem's density of population must have been 160 to 200 persons per acre because this was the approximate density of ancient cities generally is an assumption that is hard to sustain.

BROSHI (1599c) presents an abbreviation and adaptation of his previous article in French. He comments that Josephus, who is usually quite exact with figures, is unrealistic when it comes to population figures. In particular, he regards as impossible Josephus' statement that there were 204 villages in Galilee (Life 235), of which the smallest had 15,000 inhabitants (War 3. 587–588).

REALBERG (1599d) finds an organic relationship between the socio-religious characteristics and politics of Jewish governments and the concomitant growth or decline of populations. Population growth occurred under kings, notably the Hasmoneans and Herodians, who were diplomatically and militarily effective. On the other hand, zealotry, messianism, and theocracy brought about the destruction of three quarters of the Jewish population of Palestine.

AVI-YONAH (1599e), pp. 219–220, concludes that Josephus' estimate of the population of Palestine is a palpable exaggeration, particularly his assertion that Galilee in 67 had 204 cities and villages with three million Jews (Life 235, War 3. 41–43). AVI-YONAH, on the basis of Josephus' statement that in 66 Galilee produced a force of 60,000 infantry for Josephus (War 2. 583), indicates a population of 750,000. We may, however, comment that the number of troops

which Josephus was able to raise was probably relatively small, since Galilee was a stronghold of the revolutionaries, such as John of Gischala, who fiercely opposed Josephus' mission. AVI-YONAH similarly claims that Josephus' figure (War 6. 425) of 2,700,000 (actually 2,556,000, according to Josephus' own arithmetic) pilgrims in Jerusalem for Passover is absurd. He thinks that this may have been the entire Jewish population of the country. Again, we may remark, Josephus' figure may indicate that Jews in Palestine and elsewhere took seriously the obligation to go to Jerusalem for the pilgrimage festivals.

MEYERS and STRANGE (1599f) note that there is a sudden appearance of Late Hellenistic wares in Galilee about the second century B.C.E. This accords with what we find in Maccabees and in Josephus and suggests a repopulation of Galilee, perhaps first under Aristobulus (Ant. 13. 318). This resurgence of population in the Hellenistic period more closely characterizes Lower Galilee than Upper Galilee. We may, however, remark that the passage cited by MEYERS and STRANGE (Ant. 13. 318) speaks of the forcible conversion of the Ituraeans, who lived in Lebanon, not in Galilee.

DOR (1599g) cites Josephus (War 1. 155, 1. 204, 2. 461–465, 2. 588, and Ant. 14. 314–318) for evidence of Jewish population in the region of Mount Hermon.

WILKINSON (1599h), p. 23, objecting to Josephus' statement that the Jews in Galilee numbered three million, says that Josephus' more unreasonable figures usually look more sensible when divided by ten, and suggests that it is quite possible that those who helped him in the composition of his Greek misunderstood what he had said. We may ask why his assistants understood the other things that he said but misunderstood his figures.

MCCOWN (1599i) comments that if, indeed, there were 204 villages in Galilee (Life 235), the smallest of which had 15,000 inhabitants (War 3. 587–588), this would give Galilee a population of more than three million, that is, more than 3000 persons per square mile, making a total of nearly eighteen million for the 6000 square miles of western Palestine. There is no reason to suppose, he concludes, that Palestine was then several times more productive than it is today. We may comment that the two statements upon which this estimate of population rests occur in works which were written about two decades apart and may have been influenced by the different purposes and audiences for which they were composed. Alternatively, we may suggest that not all of western Palestine had an equal density of population, that a great deal of Palestine was then east of the Jordan, and that to assert that Palestine was then not more productive than it is today is to disregard the evidence of the Talmud, as it is to assume that the standard of living of people then was what it is today. We may add that the island of Java, for example, with a similarly agricultural economy, today, with 51,000 square miles, has a population of approximately 88,000,000 – approximately 1728 per square mile.

### 16.10: Military Aspects of the War and in Josephus in General

- (1600) ISRAEL ABRAHAMS: *Campaigns in Palestine from Alexander the Great*. Oxford 1927.
- (1601) SAMUEL J. PEASE: *The Technique of Battle Descriptions in the Greek Historians*. Diss., University of Chicago 1932.
- (1602) ADOLF A. STENDER-PETERSEN: *Quemadmodum efficiatur, ut abundare videantur, quae deerunt* (in Danish). In: *Festkrift til Louis L. Hammerich pa tresarsdagen den 31. Juli 1952*. Copenhagen 1952. Pp. 230–241.
- (1603) ERIC BIRLEY: 'Alae' and 'Cohortes Milliariae'. In: *Corolla Memoriae Erich Swoboda Dedicata*. Graz/Cologne/Böhlau 1966. P. 66.
- (1604) WITOLD DZIĘCIOL: *Józef Flawiusz Historyk Żydowski*. London 1966.
- (1605) D. A. SADDINGTON: *The Roman Auxilia in Tacitus, Josephus and Other Early Imperial Writers*. In: *Acta Classica* 13, 1970, pp. 89–124.
- (1605a) WERNER MÜLLER: *Die heilige Stadt. Roma quadrata, himmlisches Jerusalem und die Mythe vom Weltnabel*. Stuttgart 1961.
- (1605b) S. AHARAH: *The Military Battle Line in the Great Revolt* (in Hebrew). In: *Turim la-Ḥinukh Ulehoraah* 4, 1976, pp. 65–73.
- (1605c) JOAQUÍN GONZÁLEZ ECHEGARAY: *La guarnición romana de Judea en los tiempos del NT*. In: *Estudios Biblicos* 36, 1977, pp. 57–84.
- (1605d) JAAKKO SUOLAHTI: *The Junior Officers of the Roman Army in the Republican Period. A Study on Social Structure*. Helsinki 1955.
- (1605e) GRAHAM WEBSTER: *The Roman Imperial Army of the First and Second Centuries A.D.* London 1969; 2nd ed. 1979.
- (1605f) GOHEI HATA: *The Jewish War of Josephus: A Semantic and Historiographic Study*. Diss., Ph.D., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1975.

ABRAHAMS (1600) summarizes Josephus' statements on the strategy and tactics in the 'War'.

PEASE (1601) notes the poetic and rhetorical elements in the battle descriptions of various historians, including Josephus. In Josephus' descriptions he remarks particularly on the frank sensationalism, the attempts to win the favor of the emperor through insincere flattery, exaggerated descriptions of horrors and slaughter, excessive interest in fanaticism, obsession with catalogues, and imitation of Thucydides' battle descriptions and of Euripides' excesses.

STENDER-PETERSEN (1602), pp. 231–233, compares a portion of Josephus' account of the siege of Jotapata (War 3. 269–270) and the Slavonic version thereof with Herodotus 1. 10–11, Polyaeus' *Strategemata* 95 and 346–347, Livy 23. 44, Valerius Maximus 7. 4. 3. 346, and Frontinus' *Strategemata* 74–75.

BIRLEY (1603) doubts the accuracy of Josephus' statements on the size of auxiliary regiments.

DZIĘCIOL (1604), to judge from the English summary, pp. 199–203, has a chapter on 'Strategy and Tactics in the Jewish War', in which he comments that the fact that the campaigns of Vespasian and Titus were planned on a large scale is evidence that the Romans had a high regard for the military prowess of their Jewish opponents.

SADDINGTON (1605), who attempts to establish the extent to which, from Augustus to Vespasian, professional regiments can be distinguished from other types of auxiliary units, comments that Josephus uses general rather than specific terms, and that it is not always clear that Josephus is employing terms at any



given time in a technical sense. On the two occasions when Josephus and Tacitus refer to the same auxiliaries, in one case (*Annals* 12. 54. 3, War 2. 236) it is Josephus who gives additional explanatory detail, whereas in the other (*Histories* 5.1. 2, War 5.47ff.) it is Tacitus who supplies the more precise information.

MÜLLER (1605a), p. 10, describes the Roman camp (War 3. 52 and 3. 79ff.) as a city created on the spur of the moment.

I have not seen AHARAH (1605b).

GONZÁLEZ ECHEGARAY (1605c), emphasizing matters of terminology, deals with the history of the procuratorship and the military nature of his office, the Greek and Latin terms for procurator in Josephus and in the New Testament, the various cases of intervention of Roman legions in Palestine, and the recruitment, organization, and role of the auxiliary troops of the procurators.

SUOLAHTI (1605d) comments on the make-up of the military council of Lucius Cornelius Lentulus Crus in 49 B.C.E. (*Ant.* 14. 228–229, 238–240) which relieved the Jewish citizens of Ephesus from military service.

I have not seen WEBSTER (1605e), who (pp. 169–170) discusses the Roman siege-works and camps at Masada and (pp. 243–245) the Roman siege of Jotapata (War 3. 141–339). [See *infra*, p. 932.]

HATA (1605f) compares Josephus' account of the Roman army with that of Polybius and concludes that Polybius' account was too anachronistic for Josephus to have used it. We may comment that, in view of Josephus' close relations with the Flavian generals Vespasian and Titus, it would seem likely that they supplied him with up-to-date military information. Moreover, whatever success he had at first in the defense of Galilee was due to the study of military tactics.

### 16.11: Vespasian and Titus

- (1606) LEON HOMO: *Vespasien, l'Empereur du Bon Sens* (69–79 ap.J.-C.). Paris 1949.
- (1607) ARNALDO D. MOMIGLIANO: *Panegyricus Messalae* and '*Panegyricus Vespasiani*': Two References to Britain. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 40, 1950, pp. 39–42.
- (1608) ERNST BAMMEL: *Zum Kapitalrecht in Kyrene*. In: *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte (Roman. Abt.)* 71, 1954, pp. 356–359.
- (1609) ADALBERT BRIESSMANN: *Tacitus und das flavische Geschichtsbild* (*Hermes Einzelschriften*, Heft 10). Wiesbaden 1955.
- (1610) WILHELM WEBER: *Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus*. Stuttgart 1921.
- (1611) HANS DREXLER, rev.: ADALBERT BRIESSMANN, *Tacitus und das flavische Geschichtsbild*. In: *Gnomon* 28, 1956, pp. 519–527.
- (1612) MARCEL DURRY: *Les empereurs comme historiens d'Auguste à Hadrien*. In: *Fondation Hardt pour l'Étude de l'Antiquité classique, Entretiens*. Vol. 4: *Histoire et Historiens dans l'Antiquité*, Genève 1956. Pp. 213–245.
- (1613) G. B. TOWNEND: *Cluvius Rufus in the Histories of Tacitus*. In: *American Journal of Philology* 85, 1964, pp. 337–377.
- (1614) CECIL ROTH: *Did Vespasian Capture Qumrân?* In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 91, 1959, pp. 122–129.
- (1615) GLANVILLE DOWNEY: *The Gate of the Cherubim at Antioch*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 29, 1938–39, pp. 167–177.

- (1616) GLANVILLE DOWNEY: The Anti-Jewish Outbreak of November, A.D. 70. In his: *A History of Antioch*. Princeton 1961. Pp. 586–587.
- (1617) CARL H. KRAELING: The Jewish Community at Antioch. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 51, 1932, pp. 130–160.
- (1618) ALBERT HENRICHs: Vespasian's Visit to Alexandria. In: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 3, 1968, pp. 51–80.
- (1619) I. A. F. BRUCE: Nerva and the *Fiscus Judaicus*. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 96, 1964, pp. 34–45.
- (1620) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Ph.D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (1620a) GUIDO KASCHNITZ VON WEINBERG: Das Schöpferische in der römischen Kunst, In: HELGA VON HEINTZE, ed., *Römische Kunst*, vol. 1. Reinbek bei Hamburg 1961.
- (1620b) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *New Testament History*. London 1969; New York 1971.
- (1620c) HANS LEWY: Tacitus on the Antiquity of the Jews and Their Character (in Hebrew). In his: *Studies in Jewish Hellenism*. Jerusalem 1969. Pp. 115–196.
- (1620d) HANS LEWY: The Fate of the Holy Vessels after the Destruction of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In his: *Studies in Jewish Hellenism*. Jerusalem 1969. Pp. 255–258.
- (1620e) ZVI YAVETZ: Reflections on Titus and Josephus. In: *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 16, 1975, pp. 411–432.
- (1620f) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: La Philanthropie de tous les jours chez les écrivains juifs hellénisés. In: *Paganisme, judaïsme, christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique*. In: *Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*. Paris 1978. Pp. 35–44.
- (1620g) HERMANN BENGTON: *Die Flavii: Vespasian, Titus, Domitian*. München 1979.

HOMO (1606), pp. 252–276, presents a general survey of Vespasian's role as a general in the Jewish War.

MOMIGLIANO (1607) argues that Josephus (War 3. 4) exaggerates the part played by Vespasian in conquering Britain under Claudius and appositely notes the close similarity between Josephus and Silius Italicus (Punica 3. 597). Such a suggestion seems plausible enough in view of Josephus' close dependence upon the Flavian house while he was in Rome.

BAMMEL (1608) considers War 7. 445 (a case involving Catullus, the Roman governor of Libya under Vespasian) and Life 424 (the insurrection of Jonathan in Cyrene) as evidence for a date of the first century for capital punishment in Cyrene.

BRIESSMANN (1609), noting that both Josephus and Tacitus have used the same sources for their account of the Flavians for the years 69–70, compares their treatment of the rise of the Flavians, the traitorship of Caecina (Vitellius' general), the military campaign of Antonius Primus, the rise of Flavius Sabinus and the fall of Vitellius, and the beginning of Flavian rule and the uprising of Civilis. BRIESSMANN, who owes much to WEBER (1610), aptly notes many apparent instances of distortions of fact on the part of Josephus, who, as a client of the Flavians, displayed servile acceptance of their every word and deed. These distortions are all the more flagrant because Josephus and Tacitus apparently used the same basic material; but, in his effort to show how Tacitus has corrected these, BRIESSMANN forgets that Tacitus also, despite his protestations, is not without anger and prejudice. DREXLER (1611), in his severe review of this book, rightly describes the reading of it as sheer torture, but the work is marked by meticulous analysis.

DURRY (1612), pp. 226–230, has a much briefer discussion than BRIESSMANN of Josephus as a source for reconstructing the official Flavian version of the history of that dynasty. In contrast to BRIESSMANN, for whom he has more regard than does DREXLER, and who is surprised that Josephus blackens the character of Caecina even though he is apparently writing before Caecina's implication in a conspiracy in 79 against the dynasty, DURRY rightly remarks that Josephus reflects the attitude toward Caecina after his implication in the conspiracy in regarding him as a real traitor.

TOWNEND (1613) argues that Josephus' account of Caecina refutes BRIESSMANN's contention that the passages critical of Caecina in the 'War', as compared with Tacitus (*Histories* 2. 99, 3. 13 ff.), cannot have reached their final form until after his execution in 79 (Dio 66. 16). Caecina, we may comment, stood too high in favor with Vespasian, and Josephus was too much a servile flatterer, to adopt an independent position.

ROTH (1614) emphatically refutes the suggestion that Vespasian captured Qumrân, appositely noting that Josephus (*War* 4. 477) states merely that Vespasian visited the Dead Sea region and says nothing about military operations there.

DOWNEY (1615) plausibly suggests that the reason why Titus erected statues of 'cherubim' at Antioch was that he wished to compensate the anti-Semites there for his refusal of their request to expel the Jews and to revoke their citizenship (*War* 7. 103–111).

DOWNEY (1616) successfully contests the hypothesis of KRAELING (1617) that Josephus' descriptions of the burning of Jews by anti-Semites in the theatre at Antioch on the ground that they were plotting to set fire to the city (*War* 7. 46–52) and of the great fire at Antioch described shortly thereafter are actually accounts of the same event. KRAELING had found it hard to believe that Jews would have been massacred before there had actually been a fire in the city; but Josephus' accounts of the relations between Greeks and Jews in the Hellenistic cities shows much deep-seated antagonism and many completely groundless accusations.

HENRICHS (1618) says that Josephus has strikingly distorted the historical facts surrounding Vespasian's accession (*War* 4. 603–606 and 616–618) and cites BRIESSMANN (1609). He notes, for example, that Josephus reverses the chronological order of events as recounted in Tacitus' 'Histories' (2. 79) in trying to show Vespasian's reluctance to become emperor: in Tacitus it is only after Tiberius Julius Alexander has taken the lead that Vespasian's own troops at Caesarea hail him as emperor, whereas in Josephus Alexander joins later. In particular, Josephus does not mention at all Vespasian's visit to the Temple of Sarapis and his miraculous cure of a blind man and of a cripple, a remarkable event which Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius all deem deserving of mention and which surely was calculated to show Vespasian as an extraordinary, divinely-gifted man who was more than human and who deserved the throne. Josephus' omission of this blatantly political act of ambition by his patron must be ascribed, we agree, to an attempt to build up Vespasian as the reluctant candidate for the emperorship. [See *infra*, p. 933.]

BRUCE (1619) says that the *Fiscus Iudaicus*, requiring that the existing tax of a half shekel (two Attic drachmas) be paid for the maintenance of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome, was introduced by Vespasian shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem in 70. As to Josephus' statement (War 7. 218) that Vespasian imposed a tax on all Jews everywhere, this would seem unfair in view of the fact, to be gauged from Josephus' silence, that the Diaspora Jews did not aid the Palestinian Jews in the revolt (and, in fact, we may add, even turned over Palestinian revolutionaries to the Roman government for punishment, as we see in War 7. 410–416); but, says BRUCE, Vespasian imposed the tax simply because he needed money and not because he desired to impose a tax on the Diaspora Jews for the upkeep of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in Rome. Alternatively, we may comment, as does COHEN (1620), that the fact that Dio Cassius (66. 4. 3) says, in a passage that has no parallel in Josephus, that many Jews, both from the rest of the Roman Empire and from beyond the Euphrates, volunteered to help in the revolution may be behind the tax. We may add that the fact that the tax was precisely the amount previously given to the Temple was calculated to remind the Jews that the Romans had destroyed the Temple, and this would surely be deemed provocative.

KASCHNITZ VON WEINBERG (1620a), pp. 133–134, describes the art carried in the triumph of Vespasian and Titus (War 7. 123ff.).

BRUCE (1620b), pp. 360–361, identifies the prophecy (Daniel 9. 24–27; War 6. 312) that a man from Judaea would gain supreme world-dominance as referring to Vespasian (War 2. 351–354). We may, however, remark that this hardly seems likely, since the Biblical passage clearly refers to a Jew.

LEWY (1620c), pp. 155–156, remarks on the close correspondence between Josephus (War 1. 6) and Philostratus (Life of Apollonius of Tyana 6. 29) in the statement that Titus declared that he had merely lent his arms to G-d and that it was through G-d's work that he had captured Jerusalem. Thus, says LEWY, Josephus was trying to diminish the ties between the revolutionaries in Israel and the Jews in the Diaspora. LEWY, p. 193, commenting on Titus' role in the decision to burn the Temple, concludes that Josephus (War 6. 236–243) transferred some of Titus' words to other members of the council that met to decide the fate of the Temple, and that it was the fact that the Temple was a gathering place for the revolutionaries that led to Titus' decision to destroy it.

LEWY (1620d) comments on the passage (War 6. 387–391) concerning the vessels brought from the Temple to Rome by Titus and on Josephus' discussion (War 7. 148–150) concerning the Temple vessels displayed in Titus' triumph. He notes that according to Josephus (War 6. 388) Titus plundered two golden candelabra. He conjectures that the two were later brought from Rome to Carthage and from there to Constantinople, and that thereafter Justinian sent one to Jerusalem and left the other in Constantinople.

YAVETZ (1620e) notes that while Josephus in Book 5 of the 'War' praises Titus' political, military, and administrative talent, he makes no effort to hide his ruthlessness. Josephus genuinely respected Titus and praised him on his own initiative, reserving his strongest strictures for those revolutionary Jews who insisted on fighting to the bitter end. It is Josephus' contention that Titus

punished the rebels because he had to do so, but that he did so reluctantly. YAVETZ suggests that since there were rumors incriminating Titus in the death of his father Vespasian (Dio 66. 17. 1), he felt a need to have Josephus praise his clemency; and Josephus, as a faithful client, understood this. YAVETZ concludes that while Titus may have appreciated Josephus' work he could hardly have expected it to improve his reputation. We may suggest that perhaps the parts of the 'War' which were critical of Titus reflect a possible revision of the work by Josephus after Titus' death, when he was no longer afraid to be candid about his former patron, especially in view of the enmity toward Titus of the new Emperor, Domitian, who was so hostile toward his predecessor and brother.

PELLETIER (1620f) contrasts John of Gischala's affected humanity (War 2.587) and Titus' genuine humanity (War 4. 96), according to Josephus, and concludes that Josephus wished to celebrate the clemency of Titus.

I have not seen BENGTON (1620g). [See *infra*, p. 933.]

### 16.12: The Arch of Titus

- (1621) HANS U. INSTINSKY: Der Ruhm des Titus. In: *Philologus* 97, 1948, pp. 370–371.
- (1622) MAXIMILIAN KON: The Menorah of the Arch of Titus. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 82, 1950, pp. 25–30.
- (1623) WALTHER ELTESTER: Der siebenarmige Leuchter und der Titusbogen. In: WALTHER ELTESTER, ed., *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche. Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 26). Berlin 1960; 2nd ed., 1964. Pp. 62–76.
- (1624) HEINRICH STRAUSS: The Fate and Form of the Menorah of the Maccabees (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 6, 1960, pp. 122–129. Trans. into German in: *Das Münster am Hellweg* (Essen) 15, 1962, pp. 43–63.
- (1625) GERHARD KLEINER: Der Triumph des Titus. In: DIETER AHRENS, ed., *Festschrift Max Wegner zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*. Münster 1962. Pp. 42–43.
- (1626) DANIEL SPERBER: The History of the Menorah. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 16, 1965, pp. 135–159.
- (1627) JOSEPH GUTMANN: A Note on the Temple Menorah. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60, 1969, pp. 289–291.
- (1628) HEINRICH STRAUSS: Menorah on the Arch of Titus. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 11, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1363–1367.
- (1629a) LEON YARDEN: The Tree of Light; a Study of the Menorah, the Seven-branched Lampstand. London 1971.
- (1629b) LEON YARDEN: The Tree of Light. A Study of the Menorah, the Seven-branched Lampstand. — Agdistis, Attis and the Almond Tree. Another Look at Movers' Etymology. Uppsala 1972.

INSTINSKY (1621) concludes that in the light of War 3. 8 and 3. 64–69, the inscription on the Arch of Titus is exact and not guilty of rhetorical exaggeration; but, we may comment, Josephus himself, in view of his dependence on Titus, is hardly a proper source to judge the impartiality of the inscription.

KON (1622) comments on War 7. 148 that the Temple menorah borne in Titus' triumphal procession (later depicted on the Arch of Titus) was constructed on a different pattern from our (ῥημέτερον) ordinary usage. KON rightly

objects to interpreting this to mean that the candlestick was not the same as that which had been in the Temple and concludes that the menorah on the Arch of Titus is a faithful representation of the Temple's menorah.

ELTESTER (1623) interprets ἡμέτερον (War 7. 148) as referring to general candelabra and not as indicating that the menorah was different from other Jewish candelabra. He argues that Josephus' source was more grounded in the Greek than in the Roman world and that it is therefore less likely that he is here clearly following the otherwise unknown Roman writer, Antonius Julianus. He concludes that the relief and that Josephus' description are in complete harmony, and that Josephus' description of the triumphal procession is also accurate. We may comment that the original purpose of the 'War', as stated in its preface (War 1. 3), was to warn Josephus' countrymen not to revolt; hence it would make sense to compare the menorah to other Jewish candelabra rather than to candelabra in general. Moreover, this interpretation accords with the Talmud's prohibition (Rosh Hashanah 24b, 'Avodah Zarah 43b, Menahoth 28b) against making an exact replica of the menorah.

STRAUSS (1624) presents a history of the menorah, noting that, according to Josephus (Ant. 12. 318), it was Judah the Maccabee who made the candelabrum, whereas the Talmudic tradition (Rosh Hashanah 24b, 'Avodah Zarah 43b), which STRAUSS regards as more reliable, attributes the gold version to the later Hasmoneans.

KLEINER (1625), drawing upon the fact that according to Josephus and Dio the triumphal procession belonged to both Vespasian and Titus, concludes that the arch must similarly have commemorated both. Indeed, though most viewers are struck by the apparently missing figure of Vespasian, KLEINER identifies one of the figures on the arch as Vespasian himself.

SPERBER (1626), who constantly cites Josephus' attitude toward images, concludes that because he was a priest Josephus' authority is throughout reliable and that the representation on the Arch of Titus is, on the whole, accurate. He notes that in Rome triumphal arches were considered as documents and that accuracy was consequently demanded from them. SPERBER is forced to admit, however, that the base is vastly out of proportion to what it bears. In general, the description of the upper part accords with the Talmudic description, but the description of the lower part, with its motif of two eagles, was altered by someone who was oriented toward Rome. SPERBER interprets War 7. 148–150 to refer to the law forbidding Jews to make candlesticks similar to that in the Temple.

GUTMANN (1627) notes that the evidence for the shape of the base of the Temple menorah rests mainly on the artistic testimony from the coins of Antigonus and from the Arch of Titus. He concludes that this evidence is too problematic and inconclusive to prove any significant relationship.

STRAUSS (1628), in a survey remarkably detailed for an encyclopedia, notes that the problem of the menorah on the Arch of Titus is its pedestal consisting of two octagonal casings with eagles and sea monsters, whereas, according to all Jewish sources (for example, Menahoth 28b in the Talmud) and archaeological finds, the menorah stood on three legs, usually lion's paws. After surveying the

theories presented by various modern scholars, STRAUSS leaves open the question as to whether Josephus' description confirms or contradicts the depiction on the Arch. We may comment, however, that the interpretation that the central shaft 'stretched' out from its pedestal is more closely in accord with both his view that the menorah differed from those in general use as well as with the Biblical description (Numbers 8. 4).

YARDEN (1628a), pp. 3–6, disputes the widespread view that the menorah of the Temple fell into Roman hands, since Josephus nowhere states this. We may, however, remark that Josephus' reference (War 7. 148) to a lampstand "different from those we use in ordinary life" can refer only to the menorah. YARDEN, pp. 12–13, also comments on Josephus' discrepancy (Ant. 3. 144) with the Bible as to where the menorah stood.

YARDEN (1628b) has two investigations, the first of which is a revised version of the monograph (1628a) published under the same title. The second is a more elaborate treatment of an aspect dealt with in chapter 6 of the first-mentioned work.

### 16.13: Domitian

(1628c) E. MARY SMALLWOOD: Domitian's Attitude toward the Jews and Judaism. In: *Classical Philology* 51, 1956, pp. 1–13.

(1628d) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: Domitian's Assassination: The Jewish Involvement (in Hebrew). In: *Lectures at the Meeting of the Historical Society of Israel* 16, 1973, pp. 195–202. Trans. into English: Domitian's Assassination: The Jewish Aspect. In: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 1, 1974, pp. 116–123.

SMALLWOOD (1628c) deduces from Josephus that there was disquiet among the Jews late in Domitian's principate. It would be strange, she comments, if the 'Antiquities', completed in 93, did not mirror to some extent the contemporary situation. In particular, she suggests that Josephus' long account of Gaius' murder is a warning to Domitian not to follow in his footsteps. We may remark that tyrants generally do not catch such a subtle hint, which, in any case, was not mentioned before SMALLWOOD noticed it.

I have not seen APPLEBAUM (1628d). [See *infra*, p. 933.]

## 17: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works

### 17.0: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: the 'War'

- (1629) HELGO LINDNER: Eine offene Frage zur Auslegung des Bellum-Proömiums. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und den Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 254–259.
- (1630) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (1631) GERT AVENARIUS: Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung. Meisenheim/Glan 1956.
- (1632) HELGO LINDNER: Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum. Leiden 1972.
- (1633) WILHELM WEBER: Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus. Stuttgart 1921.
- (1634) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (1635) ANDREW Q. MORTON and SIDNEY MICHAELSON: Elision as an Indicator of Authorship in Greek Writers. In: *Revue de l'Organisation Internationale pour l'Étude des Langues Anciennes par Ordinateur*, 1973, 3, pp. 33–56.
- (1635a) LÉON HERRMANN: Chrestos. Témoignages païens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle. Bruxelles 1970.
- (1635b) GIOVANNI VITUCCI: Flavio Giuseppe e la storia della guerra giudaica. In: *Cultura e Scuola* 52, 1974, pp. 103–109.
- (1635c) MENAHEM STERN: The Time of the Composition of the *Jewish War* (in Hebrew). In: *Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* 2, 1975, pp. 29–34.
- (1635d) CHAIM RABIN: The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint. In: *Textus* 6, 1968, pp. 1–26.
- (1635e) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: Studies in the Language and Historiography of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Ph. D., Brown University, Providence 1976.
- (1635f) ROLAND G. BOMSTAD: Governing Ideas of the Jewish War of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Ph. D., Yale University, New Haven 1979.
- (1635g) PIETER J. SIJPESTEIJN: Flavius Josephus and the Praefect of Egypt in 73 A.D. In: *Historia* 28, 1979, pp. 117–125.

LINDNER (1629), in an attempt to identify the erudite Greek historians (War 1. 13–16) whom Josephus attacks for writing on ancient history rather than on contemporary events, concludes that the reference cannot be to Nicolaus of Damascus, as HÖLSCHER (1630) would have it, since Nicolaus did write of contemporaries. Nor is the reference to Josephus' assistants, since, we may comment, Josephus nowhere else implies that they were deserving of criticism. LINDNER does not consider sufficiently the possibility that this may be a *topos* in historians' prooemia, as noted by AVENARIUS (1631). LINDNER concludes that



it is not possible to identify these Greek historians, but we may suggest that perhaps Josephus is thinking of Antonius Julianus, who wrote a work on the Jews and who may be identical with the Antonius who participated in the council with Titus to determine the fate of the Temple.

LINDNER (1632), whose analysis of the sources of the 'War' concentrates on Book 4, is largely in agreement with WEBER's (1633) view that Josephus' chief source was the commentaries of Vespasian and Titus, but gives Josephus more credit than does WEBER for modifying these accounts. We may comment that Josephus cites the commentaries in the 'Life' (342, 358) rather than in the 'War', and that, in any case, Josephus hardly had to obtain his information from their commentaries when he himself was a participant for at least part of the war and had first-hand sources.

As to the date of the 'War', we may suggest that inasmuch as Justus (Life 359–360) had written his work twenty years before Josephus' reply in the 'Life' and if indeed Justus' work was primarily an attack on the 'War', this gives a *terminus ante quem* for the 'War' of 73, if the 'Life' was an appendage written at the same time as the 'Antiquities' (93 C.E.).

COHEN (1634) rejects the usual date of 75–79 for the 'War', since Titus comes off so much better than Vespasian; but this, we may suggest, may be due simply to the fact that Titus played a much more significant role in the war than did Vespasian. The fact that Josephus paints such a black picture of Caecina shows, says COHEN, that the work was published after 79, when Caecina was executed by Titus for an alleged plot against the emperor (Dio 66. 16. 3; Suetonius, Titus 6).

COHEN also notes that in Book 7 much more prominence and favor are given to Domitian, and concludes that it is a Domitianic addition. He asserts that, in fact, Book 6 forms an admirable close to the work. He notes other contrasts: thus, whereas John's crimes in the earlier books are formulated in terms of sacrilege, in Book 7 they are viewed as violations of Halakhah. We may comment that the conclusion of MORTON and MICHAELSON (1635) in their statistical study is that Book 7 differs markedly from the other books of the 'War' in style.

Finally, it is unlikely, concludes COHEN, that Josephus had presented only part of his 'War' to Vespasian (Life 361, Against Apion 1. 50–51), since this would make pointless Josephus' question (Life 359) as to why Justus did not publish his history in the lifetime of Vespasian and Titus, since otherwise Justus could have replied that Josephus had published only part of his history and had suppressed the rest.

HERRMANN (1635a), pp. 115–121, unconvincingly claims that War 6. 288–300, 300–310 are Christian interpolations by Hippolytus, the author of the 'Philosophumena', who also interpolated War 2. 163–164.

VITUCCI (1635b) presents a general survey of the 'War', its sources and credibility, and its place in Greek historiography.

STERN (1635c) concludes that the date of the composition of the 'War' was 79–81 because of the negative portrayal of Alienus Caecin(n)a, the cold depiction of Vespasian, and the warm appraisal of Titus.

RABIN (1635d) concludes that the translation of the 'War' from the Aramaic original may be due to Josephus' writing for a Roman audience and may show that he knew something of the standards of translation observed by Roman writers for versions into Latin. We may comment that inasmuch as we do not have a single line of Josephus' original it is precarious to generalize about his theory of translation.

LADOUCEUR (1635e), after considering the various theories as to the sources of the 'War', concludes that any attempt to divide the text into portions deriving from a Roman source as against portions due to Josephus himself is arbitrary. Again, the attempt to turn the 'War' into a 'history of salvation' disregards the Greco-Roman audience for whom the work was intended. The 'War' is an apology which should be interpreted in terms of its *Sitz in Leben*. LADOUCEUR stresses, in particular, Josephus' debt to Polybius' conception of historiography.

BOMSTAD (1635f) assumes that the 'War' has that degree of unity which distinguishes history from chronicle.

SIJPESTEIJN (1635g) notes that on the basis of War 7. 434 it has been generally assumed that Curtius Paulinus, who is usually identified with Curtius Paulinus of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (10. 1266, lines 20–29), was either prefect or vice-prefect of Egypt in ca. 73. SIJPESTEIJN concludes, however, that these are two different persons, one a *tribunus militum*, Curtius Paulinus, ca. 58–59, and the other a prefect of Egypt, Valerius Paulinus, ca. 73. He postulates that the Paulinus mentioned by Josephus is the same as Valerius in Strassbourg Papyri 541.

### 17.1: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: the 'Life'

- (1636) RICHARD LAQUEUR: Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Giessen 1920.
- (1637) EMIL SCHÜLER: The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135). Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973.
- (1638) MATTHIAS GELZER: Die Vita des Josephus. In: Hermes 80, 1952, pp. 67–90. Rpt. in his: Kleine Schriften. Vol. 3. Wiesbaden 1964. Pp. 299–325.
- (1639) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, ed. and trans.: Flavius Josèphe: Autobiographie. Paris 1959.
- (1640) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes. In: Theokratia 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (1641) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (1642) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: Josephus the Man and the Historian. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (1643) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus und Justus. In: Klio 26, 1933, pp. 67–95.
- (1644) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Cicero's Conception of Historiography. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1951.
- (1645) GEORG MISCH: Geschichte der Autobiographie. Vol. 1, Part 1. 3rd ed., Frankfurt 1949. Trans. into English by Ernest W. Dickes: A History of Autobiography in Antiquity. London 1950.
- (1646) JOSEPH W. SWAIN: Supplementary Remarks. In: James T. Shotwell, The History of History. Vol. 1. New York 1939. Pp. 151–154.

- (1646a) DAVID A. BARISH: The *Autobiography* of Josephus and the Hypothesis of a Second Edition of His *Antiquities*. In: Harvard Theological Review 71, 1978, pp. 61–75.
- (1646b) TESSA RAJAK: Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World. Diss., 2 vols., Oxford 1974.

There has been much interest in the 'Life', the oldest autobiography (though, of course, most of it is devoted to a single episode in the author's life) that we possess from antiquity in its original form.

That the 'Life' is an appendix to the 'Antiquities' is clear from Antiquities 20. 266, which states that Josephus intends to append a brief statement about his family and career "while persons still survive either to refute or to corroborate what I say". Again, at the end of the 'Life' (430), Josephus indicates that the 'Life' is an appendix to the 'Antiquities' when he says: "Having now, most excellent Epaphroditus, rendered you a complete account of our antiquities, I shall here for the present conclude my narrative". Inasmuch as the 'Life' assumes the death of Agrippa II (359), which, according to the ninth century Byzantine encyclopedist Photius, occurred in 100, while the 'Antiquities' was completed in the thirteenth year of Domitian (93/94), according to Josephus (Ant. 20. 267), LAQUEUR (1636), p. 5, presents the theory that there were two different editions of the 'Antiquities', the first omitting both Antiquities 20. 259–266 and the 'Life' and the second omitting 20. 258 and 267–268. The second edition, he suggests, was due to the publication of a rival account of the Jewish War by Justus of Tiberias, who had attacked Josephus for the role which he had played in that revolt. Hence Josephus decided to append an apologia, namely his 'Life', to the 'Antiquities', while introducing Antiquities 20. 259–266 to provide the transition. The revised edition of SCHÜRER (1637), accepting the view of LAQUEUR, stresses that there are two endings to the 'Antiquities', one in Antiquities 20. 259, where Josephus says "Here will be the end of my 'Antiquities'", and Antiquities 20. 267, where, apparently oblivious of his earlier statement, he says "With this I shall conclude my 'Antiquities'".

The theory of the two editions of the 'Antiquities' has been accepted by GELZER (1638) and PELLETIER (1639). On this point, however, we may comment that there is no evidence in the text tradition of Josephus of different editions, as SCHRECKENBERG (1640) has noted, and that after twenty long books it is natural for Josephus to take some time to bid the reader farewell, just as a speaker will sometimes say 'in conclusion' and keep on speaking for another few minutes before a final 'in conclusion'.

LAQUEUR hypothesizes that the nucleus of the 'Life' was an administrative report which Josephus had already utilized in the 'War'. Thus, though the 'War' was ostensibly composed twenty years before the 'Life', because the 'Life' is more original, more truthful, and less tendentious than the 'War', it is prior to the 'War'. LAQUEUR's theory that the nucleus of the 'Life' is earlier than the 'War' because it is more trustworthy has been most recently adopted by GELZER, but it is surely evident, as COHEN (1641) rightly maintains, that this is a *non sequitur*: experience teaches that truth is no necessary sign of priority. "Second thoughts", says Euripides, "are wiser"; we may add that they are sometimes truer.

Attempts, in the wake of LAQUEUR's thesis, at 'higher criticism' of the 'Life' have all failed to disclose strata within the 'Life' or differences between Book 20 of the 'Antiquities' and the 'Life' in style. Most notably THACKERAY (1642), who has been the most thorough student of Josephus' language in the present century, concludes that there are numerous links of style between Book 20 of the 'Antiquities' and the 'Life', including LAQUEUR's alleged 'early portions'. PELLETIER notes the consistency of style within the 'Life'. Of course, Josephus' administrative report to the Jewish authorities may well have been and probably was in Aramaic rather than in Greek, and hence it would be most difficult to reconstruct its style and language. A point in this connection that deserves comment, however, is that 'Against Apion', which, like the 'Life', was composed after the 'Antiquities', is written in a much more polished Greek style than the 'Life'. Of course, we may postulate that Josephus employed assistants for the former but not for the latter, though in *Against Apion* 1. 50 he speaks of assistants only for the 'War'.

From another point of view, SCHALIT (1643) shows that the 'Life' has the internal unity of a single work written for a particular purpose, namely that of refuting the charges of Justus of Tiberias.

Where the same material is covered by a biographical account and a historical narrative, as is true in the case of the 'Life' and the 'War', we may recall Polybius' statement (10. 21) that when he wrote a biographical memoir of Philopoemen he described his achievements briefly but with exaggeration (αὔξησις), as panegyric required; however, in a history such matters must be treated in detail and in a different manner because history aims at a true version of events, with a particular concern for causation. Similarly, the writers of monographs, says Polybius (7. 7. 6), dealing as they do with limited and narrow subjects, are compelled, because of poverty of matter, to exaggerate a few insignificant incidents and to write at inordinate length on subjects that scarcely deserve mention. And yet, Polybius himself wrote a monograph on the Numantine War (Cicero, *Ad Familiares* 5. 12. 2). A similar distinction is found in Cicero's request (*Ad Familiares* 5. 12) to the historian Lucceius to treat of the events of the *annus mirabilis* of his consulship in a monograph, where, he says, in contrast to a more general history, one may eulogize, "with even more warmth than perhaps you feel, and in that respect to disregard the canons of history", that is to say "a little more than may be allowed by truth" (*Ad Familiares* 5. 12. 3). Hence, as I (1644), pp. 180–193, have remarked, there was ample precedent for Cicero's request in none other than the great Polybius himself, so that Cicero ought not to be reprimanded but rather praised for asking Lucceius to write a monograph on his consulship instead of incorporating it into his general history.

As to autobiography, Tacitus, Josephus' contemporary, comments (*Agri-cola* 1) on the popularity of this genre: "Many, too, thought that to write their own lives showed the confidence of integrity rather than presumption". He cites the examples of P. Rutilius Rufus, the well-known soldier, orator, and Stoic, whose checkered career included condemnation by a jury for extortion in the province of Asia in 92 but also a consulship in 105, and M. Aemilius Scaurus,

the leading member of the Senate and a bitter opponent of Rutilius who held the consulship in 107 and 115.

Of more recent works dealing with the 'Life', MISCH (1645), pp. 328–341 (pp. 315–326 of the English edition), is largely content merely to summarize it at length. He notes the formless nature of the work and calls it second-rate both humanly and as literature.

SWAIN (1646) generally follows LAQUEUR, though he rejects what he calls a brilliant suggestion by LAQUEUR that Josephus inserted the 'Testimonium Flavianum' to gain the support of the Christians.

PELLETIER (1639), in a work which finally completes the REINACH edition of Josephus in French, has a translation which is readable and accurate. He is unusually dependent in his notes on THACKERAY. He rejects LAQUEUR's hypothesis that the 'Life' was based on a report on the military situation in his sector which Josephus wrote in Greek (or in Aramaic, as THACKERAY would have it) to the Jerusalem authorities prior to his capture. As to the inferior style of the 'Life' in contrast to the polished style of the 'War' and the absence of historical perspective, PELLETIER says that these are signs of hasty composition of a pamphlet for polemic purposes rather than of a work based on youthful notes. We may add that the unpolished style also indicates that Josephus did not have assistants for the 'Life', as he admits (Against Apion 1. 50) he had for the 'War'.

COHEN's (1641) dissertation under MORTON SMITH, which the present writer has seen, will make, it is fair to say, a major contribution to this subject. He presents the corresponding passages from the 'War' and the 'Life' in parallel columns in synoptic form with a commentary exploring the problem of self-repetition in antiquity generally (a subject which has not been dealt with previously in a systematic fashion), in the 'Antiquities' as against the 'War', and especially in the 'Life' as against the 'War'. He concludes that Josephus is not consistent, that in 'Antiquities', Books 13–14, for example, the relationship is very close to the 'War', that in 'Antiquities', Book 15, the situation changes dramatically, that 'Antiquities', Books 15–16, is a revision not of the 'War' but of a common source, where the 'Antiquities' is closer to the original source and the 'War' represents the Josephan version which he has arranged thematically.

He concludes that the 'Life' and the 'War' are based upon a written source, namely a detailed outline of the Galilean war. The 'Life' follows the chronology of this source carefully and hence should be preferred, whereas the 'War' rearranges it thematically and hence should be preferred in its statement of Josephus' mission in Galilee. Josephus' motives in the 'War' are relatively simple, namely to defend himself as an ideal general, whereas his motives in the 'Life' are not merely to refute Justus of Tiberias' accusations against him, but also to show that war was the consequence of circumstances forced upon the unwilling Jewish people. Both the 'Life' and the 'Antiquities' have a religious, Pharisaic point of view which is lacking in the 'War'.

The 'Life', COHEN concludes, was Josephus' roughest work – confused, sloppy, tendentious, inconsistent (e.g. 177–178 vs. 186), with incorrect cross-

references, with doublets, with important segments of information presented in a casual and even a startling manner.

To resolve the contradiction between the 'Life' being an appendage of the 'Antiquities' (and hence composed in 93) and Agrippa's death being mentioned therein (and hence being after 100), COHEN explores but refuses to accept the hypothesis of two editions of the 'Antiquities' or two editions of the 'Life'. He concludes that the 'Life' and the 'War' are independent revisions of a common source, which, he suggests, on the analogy of the relationship of 'War', Book 1, and 'Antiquities', Books 15–17, was a written document. The 'Life', he concludes, reflects the scope and sequence of this ὑπόμνημα more accurately than the 'War', but it is not a verbatim transcript.

COHEN notes the striking formal similarity between the 'Life', written between 93 and 100, and Tacitus' 'Agricola', written in 97–98, and shows that many of Josephus' themes are derived from the tradition of the Roman *commentarii*, especially the memoirs of Augustus, which Josephus probably knew through the work of Nicolaus.

BARISH (1646a) presents an additional argument to the view that the 'Life' is to be regarded as the conclusion of the 'Antiquities'. He notes that in Antiquities 20.266, Josephus says that he will describe his lineage and some of the events of his life. Then, in Antiquities 20.267, he says that with this (ἐπὶ τούτοις) he will end the 'Antiquities'. BARISH argues that τούτοις refers to the 'Life'. We may comment that ἐπὶ τούτοις is a phrase in which the τούτοις does not have a particular referent; moreover, if it did, the order would probably be ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις rather than ἐπὶ τούτοις δέ. Hence the meaning is probably "hereupon" or "herewith". In addition, if τούτοις referred to the 'Life' as part of the 'Antiquities' it would seem awkward immediately in the same sentence to give the number of lines in the 'Antiquities' alone.

I have not seen RAJAK (1646b), Appendix II, who discusses the correspondences and contrasts between Josephus' 'Life' and 'War'.

## 17.2: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: 'Against Apion'

- (1646d) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered. In: *Eos* 48.3, 1956, pp. 169–193.
- (1647) See Addenda, p. 934.
- (1647a) DAVID L. BALCH: "Let Wives Be Submissive . . .". The Origin, Form and Apologetic Function of the Household Duty Code (Haustafel) in I Peter. Diss., Ph.D., Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 1974.
- (1647b) DAVID L. BALCH: Josephus, Against Apion II. 145–296, A Preliminary Report. In: GEORGE MACRAE, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature 1975 Seminar Papers*. Vol. 1. Missoula, Montana 1975. Pp. 187–192.
- (1647c) MARTIN DIBELIUS: Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Jahrg. 1941/42, 2. Abhandlung). Heidelberg 1942.
- (1647d) ELIAS J. BICKERMAN: The Jewish Historian Demetrios. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at*

Sixty. Part 3: Judaism before 70 (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 12, part 3). Leiden 1975. Pp. 72–84.

- (1647e) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Judaism and Christian Beginnings. New York 1978.
- (1647f) DAVID M. HAY: What Is Proof? – Rhetorical Verification in Philo, Josephus and Quintilian. In: Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers. Vol. 2: Hellenistic Judaism Group. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 87–100.
- (1647g) ROBERT H. PFEIFFER: Hebrews and Greeks before Alexander. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 56, 1937, pp. 91–101.
- (1647h) TESSA RAJAK: Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World. Diss., 2 vols., Oxford 1974.
- (1647i) WILLIAM R. SCHOEDEL: Ignatius and the Archives. In: Harvard Theological Review 71, 1978, pp. 97–106.

TCHERIKOVER: (1646d) contends, in opposition to the commonly held view, that, in general, Jewish propaganda to the Gentiles was impossible, since there was no way for books to be produced in large numbers in antiquity and since the Greeks were so hostile to the Jews. He asserts that the Septuagint and Philo were directed to the Jews and to problems within the Jewish community rather than to Gentiles, since there is no evidence that the Greeks read the Bible before the Christian period. Josephus is an exception to this rule, since he emphasizes explicitly (Ant. 1. 5) that he wrote the 'Antiquities' for the Gentiles and that he wrote the 'Against Apion' to answer the charges of the anti-Semites ('Against Apion' 1. 3). It is true, we may comment, that there was no mass production of books in antiquity, but we do know that Jews during this period made tremendous inroads in winning converts, and this would have been possible only through propaganda. Again, it is true that the Greeks, especially intellectuals, were hostile to the Jews; but at the same time there was much interest in Judaism among the masses, and indeed much of the bitterness against the Jews is due precisely to their success in winning converts. To say, moreover, that Josephus is the exception is to ignore the relationship between the 'Against Apion' and Philo's 'Hypothetica', which exists in a fragmentary state and to which Josephus is indebted.

BALCH (1647a), in a section of his dissertation which he is preparing for publication, demonstrates that Dionysius of Halicarnassus in his encomium of Rome (Roman Antiquities 1. 9–2. 29) and Josephus in his defense of the Jewish constitution (Against Apion 2. 145–295) follow the standard rhetorical pattern for such encomia as described most fully in the later handbook by the third-century Menander of Laodicea (Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν, in: L. SPENGEL, ed., *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 3 [Leipzig 1856], pp. 331–446). He also notes at many points that Philo, in his 'Hypothetica', followed a similar model. Here again we see the parallel between Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Josephus remarked upon below. Since the handbooks prescribed the same order of topics in both encomia and invectives, Josephus is apparently following the order of topics of Apion, who, as a grammarian, we may remark, was surely well acquainted with such patterns. We may suggest that just as Tacitus in his 'Agricola' shows a number of parallels with Josephus' 'Life', so also, as a devoted student of rhetoric, he must have studied such exercises, inasmuch as in the digression about the

Britons in the 'Agricola' (10–13) and especially in the 'Germania', there are a number of indications that this pattern is being followed. Both of these works, we may add, are almost exactly contemporary with Josephus' 'Against Apion', and though not encomia as such, they contain a number of elements found in this genre. BALCH concludes that Josephus' encomium fits into the international atmosphere of the Roman Empire, where it was common for historians and rhetoricians to describe, compare, praise, slander, and apologize for various cities and peoples. He agrees with TCHERIKOVER that 'Against Apion' does not have missionary intent but is merely a defense of the Jews.

BALCH (1647b) again presents his thesis that in 'Against Apion' Josephus followed the pattern for an encomium later adopted by Menander of Laodicea in the third century.

DIBELIUS (1647c), 35–36, comments on Apion 2. 148.

BICKERMAN (1647d) concludes that Josephus, as an apologist, like other apologists writing in Greek, necessarily adopted the Greek method. Thus, in order to buttress the historical claims of their peoples, Oriental intellectuals endeavored, first of all, to challenge the dogma of Greek historians that built historical accounts around the Greeks. The Jews were hindered by the Torah, which portrayed them as a younger branch of mankind. Yet, Jewish historians, starting with Demetrius and including Josephus, discovered that it was possible to modify Biblical chronology to accord with the chief events and personages of Greek history.

SANDMEL (1647e), pp. 267–277, presents a summary of 'Against Apion'. He explains Apion's anti-Semitism as due to his Egyptian origin and, in particular, to his resentment of the plagues inflicted upon the Egyptians in the Bible and of the enrichment of the Israelites when they left Egypt. He suggests that Josephus' contempt for the Greeks would have appealed to his Roman readers. We may, however, comment that at the time when Josephus wrote, the Roman intelligentsia, to judge from such key figures as the educator Quintilian, who were among his chief readers, admired the Greeks profoundly.

HAY (1647f) concludes that both 'In Flaccum' and 'Against Apion' display major similarities in fundamental religious ideas and in types of apologetic argument. This may reflect some knowledge on Josephus' part of the writings of Philo, but probably the similarities stem primarily from the circumstance that both writers drew upon a long-standing tradition of Hellenistic Jewish apologetic. Both followed some of the conventions of contemporary pagan rhetoric, as seen in Quintilian, in designing the structure and particular arguments of their apologies. We may comment, however, that the real model of 'Against Apion' was not 'In Flaccum' but Philo's 'Hypothetica', to which it is sometimes closely parallel. Again, rather than using Quintilian as his point of departure, HAY should have employed Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who is quite clearly Josephus' model for the 'Antiquities', as seen, for example, by the titles of their works and the number of books. Moreover, he should have differentiated between the first part of 'Against Apion' and Josephus' defense of the Jewish constitution in the second part (Apion 2. 145–295), which, as BALCH (1647a) (1647b) has shown, follows Philo's 'Hypothetica' in being modeled on the stand-



ard rhetorical pattern for encomia as seen, for example, in the later Menander of Laodicea.

PFEIFFER (1647g) comments on Josephus' references (Apion 1. 168–174) to Greeks before Aristotle who mention Jews. He concludes that there is no reason to doubt that some parallels between the Greeks and Hebrews in language, literature, and philosophy can be traced back to a common source in Anatolia or Babylonia.

I have not seen RAJAK (1647h), Appendix VI, who discusses Posidonius' view of Judaism, as seen in the evidence of 'Against Apion'.

SCHOEDEL (1647i) notes that Josephus (Apion 1. 29) points to the Hebrews as having experienced even greater care in their archives than did Greek historians. The archives are, he remarks, a collection of public records similar to those found throughout the ancient world. Josephus' purpose in mentioning the genealogies is to emphasize the fidelity of the transmission of Scriptural records, which are likewise conceived of as archives.

### 17.3: Proposed Works

- (1648) HORST R. MOEHRING: *Novelistic Elements in the Writings of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., University of Chicago 1957.
- (1649) HANS PETERSEN: Real and Alleged Literary Projects of Josephus. In: *American Journal of Philology* 79, 1958, pp. 259–274.
- (1650) JUSTUS VON DESTINON: *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII–XVII = Jüd. Krieg Buch I*. Kiel 1882.
- (1651) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.–A.D. 135). Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973.
- (1651a) DAVID A. BARISH: The *Autobiography* of Josephus and the Hypothesis of a Second Edition of His *Antiquities*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 71, 1978, pp. 61–75.
- (1651b) DAVID ALTSHULER: The Treatise ΠΕΡΙ ΕΘΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΤΙΩΝ 'On Customs and Causes' by Flavius Josephus. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 69, 1978–79, pp. 226–232.
- (1651c) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed.: *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, Books I–IV* (Loeb Classical Library, vol. 4). London 1930.

MOEHRING (1648), pp. 10–12, presents an outline of Josephus' proposed work on 'G-d and His Substance and the Laws'. These definite references, he says, indicate that Josephus had at least drawn up an outline of it.

PETERSEN (1649) contends that we have all of Josephus' proposed works, and that most of the references in the 'Antiquities' to contemplated works are to 'Against Apion', which, however, when finally written, contained certain changes from the original plan. But, we may reply, while 'Against Apion' does contain a discussion of the nature of G-d (2. 180, 188–192, 197) and of the Jewish code of laws (2. 145–187, etc.), this discussion is brief and, in any case, is not the central theme of that work, whereas we are told in the 'Antiquities' (see especially 4. 198) that the work is to be about these subjects. PETERSEN suggests, moreover, that the running account of the Jewish War against the Romans which Josephus says he will compose at some future time (Ant. 20.267) is the

'Life'; but, we may comment, Josephus has just said (20. 266) that he will append to his 'Antiquities' a brief account of his lineage and of the events of his life (clearly a reference to the 'Life'), and it would be most awkward to refer to this same project in the next paragraph without indicating a connection with the previous paragraph, unless, of course, as some have inconclusively argued, 20. 266 is the end of Josephus' first edition and 20. 267 is the end of the second edition of the 'Antiquities'. In any case, however, we must say that the autobiography seems too personal, too brief, and too spotty to be called a running account of the war. When one recalls the many versions of the *annus mirabilis* composed by Cicero, one should not find it difficult to believe, as does PETERSEN, that Josephus would have intended to write another account of the war which he had already described in Aramaic and in Greek; such a work, we may add, would surely have found a much wider audience than the existing rather detailed work, just as the epitomes of such bulky works as Livy's history achieved considerable popularity in Rome during Josephus' time.

In a number of places Josephus refers to a work dealing with the history of Seleucid dynasty from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes until the end of the second century B.C.E. Inasmuch as we have no fragments of such a work by Josephus, VON DESTINON (1650), pp. 21–29, ingeniously suggests that these references existed in Josephus' sources and that he simply transcribed them when he used them, as Diodorus sometimes does. SCHÜRER (1651), in the revised edition, p. 56, notes that this kind of reference sometimes appears in both the 'Antiquities' and in the parallel passage in the 'War', although both, he thinks, derive independently from a common source; and he says that a definite conclusion is not possible. We may comment that if, indeed, Josephus was clearly copying a formula from his source, it would seem strange that he should do so here and seldom elsewhere.

BARISH (1651a), like PETERSEN (1649), suggests that the running account of the Jewish War against the Romans which Josephus says he will compose at some future time (Ant. 20. 267) is the 'Life'. But, as BARISH himself admits, Josephus there declares his intention to write of "the war and the later events of our history to the present day". Granted, as BARISH admits, that we are speaking of the events of Jewish history rather than of Josephus' own life, still the 'Life' does not discuss the war as a whole and certainly does not speak of later events in Jewish history, at least not systematically. Even if we declare, as does BARISH, that the 'Life' was not yet complete and that Josephus may have altered his original proposal, it would be irrelevant in an autobiography to discuss the war as a whole and certainly irrelevant to describe later events in Jewish history in which Josephus played no part. More likely, we may suggest, Josephus really intended to deal with the Jewish War again, this time more briefly, and to bring the history up to date. As a parallel we may note that in Books 12 to 20 of the 'Antiquities' he deals with the same events as with those covered in the 'War', Books 1 and 2. As to PETERSEN's argument that Josephus would not have written a second account of the war since the first was so highly acclaimed, Josephus did write a second version of Books 1 and 2 of the 'War' in the aforementioned Books 12 to 20 of the 'Antiquities'. Moreover, to judge

from the analogy of Cicero, who wrote the account of his consulship (the *annus mirabilis*) in both Greek and Latin and in both prose and poetry, the fact that a work was highly acclaimed, at least in the author's mind, did not prevent his dealing with it a second or even a third time.

ALTSHULER (1651b), commenting on Josephus' intention to write a work 'On Customs and Causes' (Ant. 4. 198 and 20. 268), adopts the suggestion of THACKERAY (1651c), pp. 414–415, that Josephus probably rewrote the 'Antiquities' more than once and may well have inserted material on Jewish law which he had not originally intended to discuss. ALTSHULER suggests that instead of writing a separate treatise Josephus revised Antiquities, Book 3, and included what he did not say there in Against Apion, Book 2. We may, however, remark that the fact that when Josephus came to the very end of his work, he says (Ant. 20. 268) that the projected work will be in four books indicates that it had, indeed, taken a very definite shape, in Josephus' mind at least.

#### 17.4: Doubtful and Spurious Works

- (1652) BERNARD CAPELLE: Hippolyte de Rome. In: Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale 17, 1950, pp. 145–174.
- (1653) BERNARD BOTTE: Note sur l'auteur du *De universo* attribué à Hippolyte. In: Recherches de Théologie ancienne et médiévale 18, 1951, pp. 5–18.
- (1654) PIERRE NAUTIN: La controverse sur l'auteur de l'Elenchos. In: Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique 47, 1952, pp. 5–43.
- (1655) PIERRE NAUTIN: Hippolyte et Josipe. Contribution à l'histoire de la littérature chrétienne du troisième siècle (Études et textes pour l'histoire du dogme de la Trinité, 1). Paris 1947.
- (1656) PIERRE NAUTIN: L'homélie d'Hippolyte sur le psautier et les œuvres de Josipe. In: Revue de l'Histoire des Religions 179, 1971, pp. 137–179.
- (1657) WILLIAM J. MALLEY: Four Unedited Fragments of the *De Universo* of the Pseudo-Josephus Found in the *Chronicon* of George Hamartolus (Coislin 305). In: Journal of Theological Studies 16, 1965, pp. 13–25.
- (1658) HEINRICH DÖRRIE: Die Stellung der vier Makkabäerbücher im Kanon der griechischen Bibel. In: Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse: Fachgruppe 5: Religionswissenschaft. Band 1, Nr. 2. Göttingen 1937. Pp. 45–54.
- (1659) CARL L. W. GRIMM: Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer. In: OTTO F. FRITZSCHE, ed., Kurzgefaßtes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testamentes. Vol. 4. Leipzig 1857. Pp. 283–370.
- (1660) EMIL SCHÜRER: The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135). Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973.
- (1661) STANISLAW SKIMINA: État actuel des études sur le rythme de la prose grecque. Cracovie 1937.
- (1662) ROBERT DEVREESSE: Introduction à l'étude des manuscrits grecs. Paris 1954.
- (1662a) BALDUINO KIPPER: Josipo (ou Josefo), traductor Grego Quase Desconhecido. In: Revista de Cultura Bíblica (São Paulo) 5, 1961, pp. 298–307, 387–395, 446–456.
- (1663) JACQUES MOREAU: Observations sur l'Ὑπομνηστικὸν Βιβλίον Ἰωσήπου. In: Byzantion 25–27, 1955–57, pp. 241–276.

- (1663a) HEINRICH DÖRRIE, ed.: *Passio SS. Maccabaeorum*. Die antike lateinische Übersetzung des IV. Makkabäerbuches (Abhandlungen der Geschichte der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, dritte Folge, nr. 22). Göttingen 1938.
- (1663b) URS BREITENSTEIN: *Beobachtungen zu Sprache, Stil und Gedankengut des Vierten Makkabäerbuchs*. Diss., Basel 1974. Published: Basel 1976.
- (1663c) WOLFGANG SPEYER: *Bücherfunde in der Glaubenswerbung der Antike*. Mit einem Ausblick auf Mittelalter und Neuzeit (Hypomnemata; Untersuchungen zur Antike und ihrem Nachleben, Heft 24). Göttingen 1970.

The ninth-century Byzantine encyclopedist Photius ascribes to Josephus a work *Περὶ τοῦ παντός* or *Περὶ τοῦ παντός αἰτίας* or *Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντός οὐσίας*, a philosophical refutation of Plato. The work is by a Christian, says CAPELLE (1652), presumably Hippolytus, the author of 'Refutatio Omnium Haeresium', who there (10. 32) cites a work of his own by the title *Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντός οὐσίας*. As BOTTE (1653) convincingly points out, the work cannot be Josephus' because it speaks of the divinity of Jesus. Photius also notices this citation in Hippolytus, as well as the Christian nature of the treatise. The ascription to Josephus, says BOTTE, is due to the fact that Josephus projected a work on the causes of the laws (Ant. 1. 25, 20. 268); hence the title *Περὶ τοῦ παντός αἰτίας*. BOTTE explains the change from *Ἰώσηπος* to *Ἱππόλυτος* on palaeographical grounds; but such a shift, as NAUTIN (1654) remarks, is palaeographically unlikely. NAUTIN furthermore remarks that few copyists would have possessed a sufficiently thorough knowledge of the text of the 'Antiquities' to have recalled Josephus' remark in his prologue that he intended to examine the causes of things, since Josephus was known as an historian rather than as a theologian. NAUTIN (1655)(1656) reaffirms his conclusion that Hippolytus is not the author.

MALLEY (1657) presents four fragments which appear under the title 'Contra Graecos' and are attributed to Josephus and argues that they are actually from 'De Universo' (*Περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντός οὐσίας*), a general plan of which he convincingly reconstructs.

Ever since Eusebius, as DÖRRIE (1658) has pointed out, the Christian tradition has ascribed IV Maccabees to Josephus. This ascription was not questioned throughout the Middle Ages, being accepted notably by Photius. In modern times scholars, such as GRIMM (1659), pp. 291–293, and SCHÜRER (1660), have been unanimous in rejecting the ascription to Josephus on the ground that IV Maccabees uses II Maccabees, which Josephus did not know. Moreover, though the cast of thought is close to that of Josephus, it smacks of being the work of an Alexandrian Jew deeply imbued with Greek philosophy, notably Stoicism. But, we may comment, its vocabulary, grammar, and style have never been thoroughly examined and compared with those of Josephus, though SKIMINA (1661), pp. 171–172, notes that its prose rhythms are very different from those in the other works of Josephus. When the new RENGSTORF Concordance is completed and used together with the truncated Josephus dictionary of THACKERAY-MARCUS, such a study should be fruitful.

DEVREESE (1662), p. 130, and KIPPER (1662a) indicate the existence in a manuscript (Barberinus Gr. 549) of citations drawn from a commentary on the Bible by a Josipos, who is not to be confused with Josephus; it is impossible,

says DEVREESE, to determine Josipos' date, and he may be as late as the fifth century.

MOREAU (1663) supplies conclusive evidence that Josippus cannot be Josephus, since he is a Christian and mentions the fourth-century Emperor Julian. He dates him about 380.

DÖRRIE (1663a) presents a first edition of the late Latin translation of IV Maccabees, the Greek original of which was eliminated from the canon by the Church Fathers of the third and fourth centuries and was ascribed to Josephus. DÖRRIE, pp. 118–119, has a specimen of the version in Latin by Erasmus, who did not translate it from the Greek but rather paraphrased it on the basis of two manuscripts of the Passion.

BREITENSTEIN (1663b), commenting on the vocabulary, syntax, and rhetorical style of IV Maccabees, dates it in the first third of the second century C.E. He notes the great difference in vocabulary between it and the Septuagint and remarks that the syntax, especially the use of the optative, accords with the atticizing movement of the second century.

SPEYER (1663c), p. 139, comments on the chronographer Josippus (Pseudo-Josephus: MIGNE, *Patrologia Graeca* 96, 1441–1444), through whom the birth-date of Jesus was reckoned.

### 17.5: Falsifications in Josephus

(1663d) WOLFGANG SPEYER: *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 1. Abt. 2. T). München 1971.

SPEYER (1663d), pp. 150–168, discusses falsifications among the Jews, with reference to the pro-Jewish documents of Josephus. He notes, p. 157, that Josephus has ascribed to Moses laws which are not to be found in the Bible; but this, we may remark, may be a reference to the Oral Law rather than an indication of falsification. SPEYER also, pp. 240–242, comments on Christian books, such as Hippolytus' 'Contra Gentes', which were ascribed to Josephus.

## 18: Josephus' Sources

### 18.0: Josephus' Sources: General

- (1664) BENEDICTUS NIESE: *Flavii Iosephi Opera*. Vol. 7. Berlin 1895; rpt. 1955.
- (1665) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: Greek Authors in Herod's Library. In: *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 5, 1961, pp. 102–109. Rpt. in his: *Nicolaus of Damascus*. Berkeley 1962. Pp. 81–86.
- (1666) HEINRICH BLOCH: *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seiner Archäologie*. Leipzig 1879; rpt. Wiesbaden 1968.
- (1667) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, ed., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (1668) TESSA RAJAK, reviser: Josephus. In: EMIL SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*. Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973. Pp. 43–63.
- (1669) CURT WACHSMUTH: *Einleitung in das Studium der alten Geschichte*. Leipzig 1895.
- (1670) ELIE (ELIAS) BICKERMAN (BICKERMANN); *La Coelé-Syrie, Notes de Géographie historique*. In: *Revue Biblique* 54, 1947, pp. 256–268.
- (1671) GERT AVENARIUS: *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*. Meisenheim/Glan 1956.
- (1671a) ROBERT WILDE: *The Treatment of the Jews in the Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries*. Washington 1949.
- (1671b) NIKOLAUS WALTER: *Untersuchungen zu den Fragmenten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Historiker (Habilitationsschrift, Univ. Halle-Wittenberg)*. Halle/Saale 1967 (type-written).
- (1671c) MARTIN HENGEL: Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und 'literarische Fälschung' in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur. In: *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique*, vol. 18: *Pseudepigrapha*. Fondation Hardt. *Vandœuvres–Genève* 1972. Pp. 229–308, 309–329 (discussion).
- (1671d) ROBERT DREWS: *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*. Washington 1973.

Though Josephus, as NIESE (1664), p. 87, notes, mentions by name no less than fifty-five writers whose works he consulted, the scholarship expended in tracing his sources has been inconclusive. The pitfalls of such studies may be illustrated by WACHOLDER's (1665) attempt to trace the books in Herod's library. He lists forty-four works, nineteen of them 'well-attested', and fourteen based on fragments of Alexander Polyhistor. Aside from the fact that neither Josephus nor his presumed major source and Herod's adviser Nicolaus of Damascus asserts that Herod had such a library, the 'well-attested' books are merely works cited by Nicolaus, there being no indication that Nicolaus, let alone Herod, had read them first-hand. Furthermore, there is no indication that Nicolaus consulted Alexander Polyhistor's sources first-hand. One thinks of the long list of authorities cited by Josephus' contemporary Pliny the Elder in the first book of his *'Naturalis Historia'*, representing the bibliography that he

ought to have consulted. In antiquity, in many cases, one author simply copied a list of citations from another.

Such a work as BLOCH (1666) is too cursory a survey to be of real value, and it is not always critical or accurate. Many scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries held the view that the authors whom an ancient writer quotes were not his main sources, and that they were at best employed merely to supplement a major source. Somehow, we must add, these major sources always seem to be lost; and even where we seem to have Josephus' source, namely the Bible for the first half of the 'Antiquities', HÖLSCHER (1667) postulated a lost Hellenistic midrash as Josephus' direct source. The idea, widely prevalent in scholarly circles at the end of the last century, that Livy and other writers used only one source at a time, presumably because it would have been so difficult to consult several manuscripts at once, has now been effectively challenged; and for Josephus, too, we now tend to regard the matter as more complex and to postulate Josephus' use of several sources, including oral ones as well. Moreover, this use of sources varies, so that RAJAK (1668) correctly asserts that, for example, in the last books of the 'Antiquities' he seems to have been more negligent and arbitrary, though sometimes he displays a critical faculty (e.g. in Ant. 14. 9, 16. 183–186, 19. 68–69, 19. 106–108).

WACHSMUTH (1669), pp. 438–449, goes so far as to assert that Josephus' citations contradict his text; but, as RAJAK has soundly noted, such a view is exaggerated.

One major means for tracing Josephus' sources is to explore his vocabulary, grammar, and style carefully, as compared with those of his alleged sources. This study has been hampered hitherto by the lack of a lexicon to Josephus; but once the RENGSTORF concordance will be completed, even with its shortcomings, as noted below, such a study may become possible. Ideally we also need a Josephus grammar and dictionary of his word-usage, as well as a handbook of his style.

BICKERMAN (1670), for example, who traces the use of the term *Coele Syria* through the third century C.E., accurately notes that the term is employed by Josephus only in some additions taken by him from his extra-Biblical sources.

AVENARIUS (1671) notes that Josephus' statements about his method and craft as an historian (e.g., his attitude toward miracles) are *τότοι* paralleled in his predecessors Polybius and Dionysius and in his successor Lucian but that very meager conclusions can be drawn from these parallels, however.

WILDE (1671a) briefly summarizes and evaluates a number of passages cited by Josephus from other authors: Clearchus of Soli (Apion 1. 176–182), Manetho (Apion 1. 73–90, 229–251), Berossus (Ant. 1. 158–160), Hermippus of Smyrna (Apion 1. 164–165), Agatharchides (Apion 1. 205–212), Menander of Ephesus (Ant. 8. 144–146, Apion 1. 116–126), Dios (Ant. 8. 147–149, Apion 1. 112–115), Mnaseas of Patras (Apion 2. 112–114), Apollonius Molon (Apion 2. 145–150), Timagenes of Alexandria (Ant. 13. 319), Nicolaus of Damascus (Ant. 1. 94–95, 159–160), Strabo (Ant. 13. 286–287, 14. 111–118), Chaeremon of Alexandria (Apion 1. 288–303), Lysimachus (Apion 1. 304–320), and Apion (Apion 2. 2–144).

I have not seen WALTER (1671b).

HENGEL (1671c) discusses Josephus' citations of anonymous and pseudonymous authors.

DREWS (1671 d), pp. 208–209, has brief summaries of Manetho, Berossus, and Menander of Ephesus, who are cited by Josephus. He asserts that the general lack of interest in these authors on the part of the Greeks is due to the fact that they contained only names and numbers.

### 18.1: Herodotus and Thucydides

(1671e) ECKHARD PLÜMACHER: Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller. Studien zur Apostelgeschichte. Göttingen 1972.

PLÜMACHER (1671e), pp. 62–63, discusses reminiscences of Herodotus and Thucydides in Josephus' 'Antiquities' and the effects of classicism upon Josephus. He does not commit himself as to whether this borrowing was direct or whether it came indirectly through Dionysius.

### 18.2: Other Classical Greek Writers of the Fifth Century B.C.E.

(1671f) YITZHAK F. BAER: Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.

(1671g) PAOLA RADICE COLACE: Choeril. Sam. fr. 4 Naeke. In: *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 104, 1976, pp. 15–20.

BAER (1671f), after rejecting THACKERAY's view that Josephus' portrait of John of Gischala is modeled on that of Catiline in Sallust, suggests that the source is the figure of Cleon in Thucydides and Aristophanes. He finds the source of Josephus' description of the struggle between rich and poor in Jerusalem during the Jewish War in Lysias' account of the thirty tyrants ('Against Eratosthenes'). We may, however, remark that the situations are commonplaces, and that there is no truly precise and unique linguistic parallel.

COLACE (1671g) comments on the identity of the γένος of the fragment of Choerilus pertaining to the Dead Sea, as quoted by Josephus (Apion 1. 172–174).

### 18.3: Menander

(1671h) DAVID FLUSSER: Josephus on the Sadducees and Menander. In: *Immanuel* 7, 1977, pp. 61–67.

FLUSSER (1671h) suggests that Menander's 'Epitrepontes', Act 5, presents a parallel to Josephus' statement that the Sadducees rejected all involvement of Providence in human life. Even the order of arguments in Menander and in Josephus are virtually identical. FLUSSER, however, concludes that it is improbable



that Josephus was directly influenced by Menander. We may, however, remark that in view of Menander's very great popularity in antiquity (he was particularly commended by Josephus' contemporary Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 10. 1. 69ff., as a model of rhetoric), such a view is by no means improbable.

#### 18.4: Clearchus of Soli and Hermippus of Smyrna

- (1672) HANS LEWY: Aristotle and the Jewish Sage According to Clearchus of Soli. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 31, 1938, pp. 205–235.
- (1673) FRITZ WEHRLI: *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar, III: Klearchos*. Basle 1948.
- (1674) PIERRE-MAXIME SCHUHL: Sur un fragment de Cléarque: Les premiers rapports entre savants grecs et juifs. In: *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 147, 1955, pp. 124–126.
- (1675) YEHOASHUA GUTMANN: *The Beginnings of Jewish-Hellenistic Literature* (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Jerusalem 1958.
- (1676) MEHAHEM STERN: *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Vol. 1: From Herodotus to Plutarch. Jerusalem 1974. Pp. 47–52.
- (1676a) HOWARD JACOBSON: Hermippus, Pythagoras and the Jews. In: *Revue des Études juives* 135, 1976, pp. 145–149.

LEWY (1672) cites cogent reasons for concluding that the learned Jew whom Aristotle, according to Clearchus (as quoted in Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 177–181), met in Asia Minor, is a figment of Clearchus' imagination similar to those representations of Oriental priestly wisdom who are often depicted as superior in wisdom to the great Greek philosophers.

WEHRLI (1673) includes the citation from 'Against Apion' (fragment 16) but has nothing to contribute.

SCHUHL (1674), apparently unaware of LEWY's article, asserts that Aristotle's meeting with the Jewish sage is by no means impossible, and cites parallels with fragments of Theophrastus, Megasthenes, and Hecataeus of Abdera. We may comment, however, that all that these parallels show is that the motif is a commonplace rather than that it is historical.

GUTMANN (1675), pp. 91–102, in his discussion of Clearchus' reference to the Jews, says that the ascription to Aristotle fits in with the fact that Theophrastus, Aristotle's successor, held a similar view of the Jews.

STERN (1676) concludes that the authenticity of the meeting between Aristotle and the Jew as cited in Josephus can hardly be maintained and that the reference to the Jews hardly necessitates the supposition that Clearchus had very much concrete knowledge of them but that this is a commonplace with regard to Eastern wisdom.

JACOBSON (1676a) clarifies the Jewish elements in the beliefs and practices attributed to Pythagoras by Hermippus of Smyrna according to Josephus (*Apion* 1. 164–165) by citing Biblical passages on the avoidance of blasphemy (Ex. 22. 27 [28]), on not passing any spot where an ass has collapsed (Ex. 23. 5), and on the avoidance of waters that leave one thirsty (Ex. 23. 7), where water is to be regarded as a metaphor for teaching. Admittedly, the interpretation of the last passage is rather remote from the literal meaning, but we may comment that

the fact that all three passages are in such close proximity to one another makes it more likely that this particular portion of Exodus is Pythagoras' source.

### 18.5: Hecataeus and Pseudo-Hecataeus

- (1677) THÉODORE REINACH: Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme. Paris 1895; rpt. Hildesheim 1963.
- (1678) MENAHEM STERN: Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism. Vol. 1: From Herodotus to Plutarch. Jerusalem 1974. Vol. 2: From Tacitus to Simplicius. Jerusalem 1980.
- (1679) WERNER JAEGER: Diokles von Karystos: Die Griechische Medizin und die Schule des Aristoteles. Berlin 1938. Pp. 134–153: Theophrast und der älteste griechische Bericht über die Juden.
- (1680) WERNER JAEGER: Greeks and Jews: The First Greek Records of Jewish Religion and Civilization. In: *Journal of Religion* 18, 1938, pp. 127–143.
- (1681) MENAHEM STERN: Chronological Sequence of the First References to Jews in Greek Literature (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 34, 1969, pp. 121–125. Trans. into English: Hecataeus of Abdera and Theophrastus on Jews and Egyptians. In: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 59, 1973, pp. 159–163.
- (1682) OSWYN MURRAY: The Date of Hecataeus' Work on Egypt. In: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 59, 1973, pp. 163–168.
- (1683) JACOB FREUDENTHAL: Hellenistische Studien. Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke. Vols. 1–2. Breslau (Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars) 1874–75.
- (1684) FRANZ SUSEMIHL: Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit. Vol. 2. Leipzig 1892.
- (1685) HUGO WILLRICH: Judaica. Forschungen zur hellenistisch-jüdischen Geschichte und Litteratur. Göttingen 1900. Chapter 3; Hekataios von Abdera und die jüdischen Literaten. Pp. 86–111. Rpt. in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, *Zur Josephus-Forschung* (Wege der Forschung, 84). Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 1–26.
- (1686) EMIL SCHÜRER: Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. Vol. 3, 3rd ed., Leipzig 1909.
- (1687) FELIX JACOBY: Hekataios aus Abdera (4). In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 7, 1912, cols. 2750–2769.
- (1688) BERNDT SCHALLER: Hekataios von Abdera über die Juden. Zur Frage der Echtheit und der Datierung. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54, 1963, pp. 15–31.
- (1689) NIKOLAUS WALTER: Zu Pseudo-Eupolemus. In: *Klio* 43–45, 1965, pp. 282–290.
- (1690) HANS LEWY: Hekataios von Abdera περί Ἰουδαίων. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 31, 1932, pp. 117–132.
- (1691) FRANZ DORNSEIFF: Echtheitsfragen antik-griechischer Literatur. Rettungen des Theognis, Phokylides, Hekataios, Choirilos. Berlin 1939.
- (1692) FELIX JACOBY: Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker. Vol. 3 A, Leiden 1940, pp. 19–21. Vol. 3a, Leiden 1943, pp. 61–66.
- (1693) PETER DALBERT: Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluß von Philo und Josephus. Hamburg-Volksdorf 1954.
- (1694) URIEL RAPAPORT: Jewish Religious Propaganda and Proselytism in the Period of the Second Commonwealth (in Hebrew). Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1965.
- (1695) OSWYN MURRAY: Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship. In: *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56, 1970, pp. 141–171.

- (1696) GÜNTHER ZUNTZ: *Aristeas Studies II: Aristeas on the Translation of the Torah*. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 4, 1959, pp. 109–126.
- (1697) JOSEF A. SINT: *Pseudonymität im Altertum: ihre Formen und ihre Gründe* (Commentationes aenipontanae, 15). Innsbruck 1960.
- (1698) JOHN G. GAGER: *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Nashville, Tennessee 1972.
- (1699) ERNEST L. ABEL: *The Myth of Jewish Slavery in Ptolemaic Egypt*. In: *Revue des Études juives* 127, 1968, pp. 253–258.
- (1700) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959.
- (1701) JOHN G. GAGER: *Pseudo-Hecataeus Again*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60, 1969, pp. 130–139.
- (1702) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Philo-Semitism among Ancient Intellectuals*. In: *Tradition* 1, 1958–59, pp. 27–39.
- (1703) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: *Hecataeus of Abdera*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 236–237.
- (1703a) PETER M. FRASER: *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford 1972.
- (1703b) MENAHEM STERN: *The Jews in Greek and Latin Literature*. In: SHMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (= *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section 1: *The Jewish People in the First Century*). Vol. 2. Philadelphia 1976. Pp. 1101–1159.
- (1703c) HANS G. KIPPENBERG: *Religion und Klassenbildung im antiken Judäa: Eine religionssoziologische Studie zum Verhältnis von Tradition und gesellschaftlicher Entwicklung* (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, 14). Göttingen 1978 (originally, diss., Berlin 1975).
- (1703d) RAOUL MORTLEY: *L'historiographie profane et les Pères*. In: *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*. Paris 1978. Pp. 315–327.

Aside from the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, I Maccabees and the Letter of Aristeas, which are the major sources for the first twelve books of the 'Antiquities', Josephus' sources are lost except for fragments. In fact, Josephus himself is a major source for reconstructing these lost writers. REINACH's (1677) collection of the classical writers referring to the Jews is grossly incomplete and in its commentary contains many questionable interpretations; the late HANS LEWY before his death in 1945 had collected much data for a new edition of REINACH, and now STERN (1678) is completing the task. In the two volumes of his work, there are more than twice as many citations as in REINACH, with introductions, bibliography, text, translation into English, and notes for each excerpt.

One of Josephus' major sources is Hecataeus of Abdera, one of the first writers who dealt systematically with the Jews, as JAEGER (1679)(1680) has noted, though STERN (1681) thinks that Theophrastus was earlier, and MURRAY (1682) thinks they were both written within the same decade.

A number of scholars have raised the question whether the fragments of Hecataeus in Pseudo-Aristeas and Josephus are by the same authors as the fragments in Diodorus, and secondly whether either or both of these sets of fragments are spurious. FREUDENTHAL (1683), pp. 165–166, SUSEMIHL (1684), pp. 644–645, WILLRICH (1685), pp. 108–109, 115–116, SCHÜRER (1686), pp. 606–607, JACOBY (1687), especially 2765–2768, SCHALLER (1688), and WALTER (1689) all regard the fragments as coming from a single author.

LEWY (1690) presents a strong case for the authenticity of the fragments in Josephus, noting that the author is well informed about the early Hellenistic period, while he is less well informed about Jewish matters, presenting a characteristically Greek picture of Jerusalem and the Temple. Moreover, argues LEWY, in the always dangerous *argumentum ex silentio*, if the author were a Jewish forger, he would have asserted that he had seen Jerusalem, a claim he never makes. Finally, Hecataeus' statement (Against Apion 2.43) that Alexander awarded the Jews the district of Samaria is borne out by I Maccabees 11.34; but all that this may show, we may comment, is that the alleged Jewish forger was acquainted with I Maccabees.

DORNSEIFF (1691), pp. 54–59, also thinks that the fragments of Choerilus (Against Apion 1.173) and Hecataeus (Against Apion 1.183–204, 2.43) cited in Josephus are authentic and that there is nothing in them which contradicts the assumption that they were written about 500 B.C.E. He notes that the excerpts quoted by Josephus so strongly depart in style from the fragments in Photius that the two cannot be by the same author.

JACOBY (1687) (1692), on the other hand, argues that the passages in Pseudo-Aristeas and Josephus are not authentic. He contends that the apparent similarities between Hecataeus in Josephus and Hecataeus in Diodorus (in Photius) are borrowings by a later Jewish plagiarizer.

DALBERT (1693), pp. 65ff., agrees with JACOBY that the fragments in Pseudo-Aristeas and Josephus are not authentic.

RAPAPORT (1694) also argues that the fragments ascribed to Hecataeus in Against Apion 1.183–204 are not authentic and that in some points they contradict the genuine book of Hecataeus of Abdera, as preserved partly in Book 40.3 of Diodorus Siculus. In particular, he says, the story about the Jewish archer Mosollamus (Against Apion 1.201–204) shows some characteristics of Jewish propaganda.

MURRAY (1695) agrees that the fragments of Hecataeus in 'Against Apion' are a forgery, together with Josephus' characterization of the author.

ZUNTZ (1696) argues that, thanks to the excerpt in Josephus, we can describe the work of Hecataeus, with its propaganda presented as the utterance of an outstanding Greek, as the model of 'Aristeas', but, we may comment, the similarities are too general and apply to a whole class of Hellenistic Jewish literature.

SINT (1697) says that Pseudo-Hecataeus seeks to obliterate the Jewish people, a conclusion, we may object, which is hardly warranted in view of the generally favorable picture of the Jews which he presents, as GAGER (1698), pp. 26–37, has shown. Though SINT admits that the possibility cannot be excluded that Josephus had authentic documents at his disposal, he argues that Josephus in most instances inserted letters and documents of a tendentious and fictitious nature, that he made no investigations of archives, and that he undertook no journeys to obtain better sources. All this, we may comment, is contradicted by what Josephus says, notably in the prooemia to the 'War', the 'Antiquities', and the 'Against Apion', and in his assertion in the 'Life' (358) about his use of the Commentaries of Vespasian and of Titus.

SCHALLER (1688) likewise contends that the fragments in Josephus are not genuine but rather belong to the genre of pseudepigraphical Jewish missionary literature, such as the 'Letter of Aristaeas', composed some time between 165 and 100 B.C.E. In particular, SCHALLER points to *Against Apion* 1. 188, where Hecataeus is quoted as saying that the priests receive the tithes: SCHALLER notes that before Maccabean times the Levites rather than the priests received the tithes, and hence this must be an anachronism. More likely, we may comment, Hecataeus simply failed to distinguish the priests from the Levites, since from a pagan point of view they both performed priestly functions. Again, GAGER (1698) has noted that a coin discovered at Beth-Zur in 1933 implies that there was a high priest or important assistant named Ezechias at about this time, precisely the name of the chief priest mentioned by Hecataeus (in Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 187).

WALTER (1689) says that while there is no direct relationship of dependency of Josephus on Pseudo-Eupolemus, Josephus did use Pseudo-Hecataeus in *Antiquities* 1. 161–168, who in turn had drawn on Palestinian haggadic tradition.

ABEL (1699) notes the contradiction between Hecataeus' account (*Against Apion* 1. 186) of the welcome accorded the Jews by Ptolemy of Egypt and the account of Agatharcides (*Ant.* 12. 5–6), who tells of Ptolemy taking the Jews captive. TCHERIKOVER (1700) suggests that the voluntary and forced emigrations took place at different times, but ABEL objects that this is purely speculative. He prefers to disbelieve Agatharcides, who lived a century after the events, and says that if indeed the Jews had been taken captive, anti-Semitic writers would certainly have exploited this. But, we may comment, the fact that Josephus says that the Jews were taken captive by Ptolemy (*Ant.* 12. 6) and then a very few paragraphs later (12. 9) says that many Jews came to Egypt of their own accord shows that Josephus did not regard the statements as contradictory but as complementary.

GAGER (1701) argues that the fragments in Josephus and in Diodorus are both authentic, and that they both agree with a pagan view of Judaism during this early Hellenistic period. In support, we may suggest that the fact that a passage is favorable to the Jews does not prove that it is not authentic, as most scholars seem to imply: the early Greek writers alluding to the Jews – Aristotle, Theophrastus, Megasthenes, and to very large extent Hecataeus – are all favorable, even laudatory, to Judaism, as I (1702) have noted.

WACHOLDER (1703) is convinced that the passage in *Against Apion* 1. 113–204 is spurious because it shows the fervor of an ardent Jew. The quotation from Hecataeus in *Antiquities* 1. 159 and Clement, *Stromateis* 5. 113, is, he says, also spurious, though by a different hand. It seems premature, we may say, to judge the work cited in *Antiquities* 1. 159 as spurious on the basis of such a brief reference.

FRASER (1703a), vol. 1, pp. 496–505, comments on Alexandrian historiography, particularly on Hecataeus of Abdera, who is cited by Josephus, in its social and intellectual setting. He also discusses, pp. 505–510, Manetho, and traces the story of the polluted Israelites back to Hecataeus.

STERN (1703b), pp. 1108–1109, accepts the authenticity of the passages attributed to Hecataeus in 'Against Apion'. He admits that Josephus' tone is more panegyric than that in the chapters of Hecataeus cited by Diodorus. However, we must remember that Diodorus' source was a general work of Hecataeus in Egypt written from an Egyptian point of view, while Josephus' is a special work 'On the Jews', according to his own statement. As to the doubts of Herennius Philo of Byblos concerning Hecataeus' authenticity, they reflect the view of a writer in the Hadrianic period who could not believe that a great Greek author could have praised the Jews. Moreover, STERN adds the strong argument that Hecataeus lived at the same time as Theophrastus, Clearchus, and Megasthenes, all of whom were positively disposed toward the Jews.

KIPPENBERG (1703c), pp. 101–105, commenting on 'Hecataeus' account of the Jews (Apion 1. 183–204), notes the similarity with the parallel passage in the 'Letter of Aristaeas' (83–120), which he dates from 145–100 B.C.E., and thus dates 'Hecataeus' from the second half of the second century B.C.E.

MORTLEY (1703d) comments on 'Hecataeus' as a propagandist.

### 18.6: Berossus

(1703e) JAMES T. SHOTWELL: *The History of History*. Vol. 1, rev. ed., New York 1939.

SHOTWELL (1703e), pp. 102–103, comments on Apion 1. 128–153, concluding that Berossus rose to the dignity of genuine history.

### 18.7: Demetrius of Phalerum

(1703f) FRITZ WEHRLI: *Die Schule des Aristoteles. Texte und Kommentar*. Vol. 4. Basel 1949.

WEHRLI (1703f), pp. 19 and 43, comments on Demetrius of Phalerum, fragment 67 (Apion 2. 45) and fragment 201 (Apion 1. 217). He regards fragment 67 as an indication of Peripatetic interest in νόμια βαρβαρικά. From fragment 201 he concludes that it is wrong to identify Demetrius the Jewish historian with Demetrius of Phalerum.

### 18.8: Aristobulus

(1704) NIKOLAUS WALTER: *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos. Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Bd. 86)*. Berlin 1964.

WALTER (1704) raises the question of Josephus' possible use of Aristobulus, the second-century B.C.E. Greco-Jewish philosopher. The fact that Josephus is silent about Aristobulus does not, of course, prove that he did not use him,

since WALTER does, inconclusively to be sure, note a few parallel phrases between Josephus and the extant fragments of Aristobulus. But, we may comment, there is great reason to believe that Philo's allegorical interpretation of the Torah was influenced by Aristobulus, and yet Philo nowhere mentions him in his numerous extant works. On the other hand, Josephus, in his extant works, is only very incidentally interested in philosophy; he mentions Philo only because of Philo's political activities. He might well have used Aristobulus in his projected work on causes, but in his extant works Josephus hardly had many opportunities to utilize the writings of an author who was concerned with allegorical interpretation of the Bible.

### 18.9: Alexander Polyhistor

- (1705) NIKOLAUS WALTER: Zur Überlieferung einiger Reste früher jüdisch-hellenistischer Literatur bei Josephus, Clemens und Euseb. In: *Studia Patristica* 7, 1966, pp. 314–320.
- (1706) JACOB FREUDENTHAL: *Hellenistische Studien. Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*. Vols. 1–2 (Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars). Breslau 1874–75.

WALTER (1705), following FREUDENTHAL (1706), pp. 12–15, posits that Josephus knew the work of Alexander Polyhistor and convincingly offers as proof the fact that when Josephus (*Ant.* 1. 239) refers to Cleodemus-Malchus he cites him from a work of Polyhistor, though not 'On the Jews'. In *Antiquities* 1. 158–160, Josephus cites Berossus, (Pseudo-)Hecataeus, and Nicolaus on Abraham: from the fact that Josephus does not cite Polyhistor WALTER deduces that he did not use him; but, we may comment, just as when, in *Against Apion* 1. 216, he cites many Greek authors and adds "and maybe many more – for my reading has not been exhaustive", thus indicating that there are others, so here the fact that he cites several authorities may be a clue to his having derived them from a single source whom he does not name at all, perhaps Polyhistor. Similarly, in *Against Apion* 1. 218 Josephus cites Demetrius of Phalerum, Philo the Elder, and Eupolemus as bearing witness to the antiquity of the Jews; that Josephus did not consult the three directly but through another source is shown by the fact that Clement (*Stromateis* 1. 141. 1. 5) cites the three and gives an excerpt from them not found in Josephus, hence showing that he and Josephus were both drawing on the same source. In this latter case the source is not Polyhistor, who has a different title for the fragment and who did not regard the authors as non-Jews.

### 18.10: Eupolemus

- (1707) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*. Cincinnati 1974.

WACHOLDER (1707), pp. 52–57, argues that since Josephus (*Ant.* 12. 415–419; *Against Apion* 1. 218) listed Eupolemus as a Gentile historian, Jo-

sephus' knowledge of his work must have been rather minimal. We may comment that in *Antiquities* 12. 415–419 Eupolemus the son of Joannes is clearly referred to as a Jew; since he is named as one of Judas the Maccabee's envoys to Rome. Apparently Josephus did not identify him with Eupolemus the historian, who is indeed referred to (*Against Apion* 1. 218) as a non-Jew. But, we may add, the fact that Eupolemus was regarded as a non-Jew need hardly have meant that Josephus consulted him any the less. On the contrary, it is clear from both the '*Antiquities*' and '*Against Apion*' that some of Josephus' strongest answers to the anti-Semites come from non-Jewish works which even the non-Jew had to acknowledge were not prejudiced in favor of Jews.

### 18.11: Artapanus

- (1707a) KONSTANTIN I. MERENTITES: *The Jewish Scholar Artapanos and His Work* (in modern Greek). Athens 1961.  
 (1707b) TESSA RAJAK: *Moses in Ethiopia: Legend and Literature*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29, 1978, pp. 111–122.

MERENTITES (1707a) comments on the relationship of Josephus and Philo to the fragments of Artapanus (ap. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9. 8. 23, 27).

RAJAK (1707b) concludes that Josephus elements in his account of Moses in Ethiopia are prior to the handling in Artapanus, that Josephus took his narrative from a literary source, that this source and Artapanus drew upon a common fund of oral, as well as possibly written, material. We may, however, remark that this is highly conjectural and that Josephus and Artapanus may have drawn upon more than one oral or written source or upon an oral source alone. Or again, Josephus may have invented details of his own, presumably for apologetic reasons. RAJAK would have done well to consider Josephus' relationship to Artapanus elsewhere, notably in their common modifications of the Abraham story. We may further remark that the fact that elements of the story appear in Targumim shows that we are dealing with an oral tradition independent of Alexandria. Hence, we may conclude that Artapanus, like the Septuagint, is dependent upon such a tradition. That Josephus' is a literary account influenced by the ethnographic tradition shows not necessarily that he had a literary source but that Josephus himself revised it.

### 18.12: Nicolaus of Damascus

- (1708) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL and JEAN STARCKY, edd.: *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Paris 1961 (1st ed. by FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL. Paris 1948–49).  
 (1709) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: *Josephus*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.  
 (1710) ARNALDO D. MOMIGLIANO: *Josephus as a Source for the History of Judaea*. In STANLEY A. COOK et al., *Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 10. Cambridge 1934. Pp. 884–887.



- (1711) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage.* Giessen 1920. Rpt. Darmstadt 1970.
- (1712) RICHARD LAQUEUR: Nikolaos von Damaskos (20). In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 17.1, 1936, cols. 362–424.
- (1713) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: Josephus and Nicolaus of Damascus. In his: *Studies in Josephus.* London 1961. Pp. 79–92.
- (1714) MENAHEM STERN: Josephus' Method in the Writing of History (in Hebrew). In: *Seventh Congress of the Israel Historical Society: Historians and Historical Schools.* Jerusalem 1962. Pp. 22–28.
- (1715) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: Nicolaus of Damascus (University of California Publications in History, vol. 75). Berkeley 1962.
- (1716) MENAHEM STERN: Nicholas of Damascus. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 12, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1140–1141.
- (1716a) MENAHEM STERN: Strabo's Remarks on the Jews (in Hebrew). In: M. DORMAN, SHMUEL SAFRAI, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *In Memory of Gedaliahu Alon, Essays in Jewish History and Philology.* Tel-Aviv 1970. Pp. 169–191. Summary in English by MERVYN LEWIS in: *Immanuel* 1, 1972, pp. 42–44.
- (1716b) MENAHEM STERN: Nicolaus of Damascus as a Source for Jewish History in the Herodian and Hasmonean Periods (in Hebrew). In: BENJAMIN UFFENHEIMER, ed., *Bible and Jewish History: Studies in Bible and Jewish History: Dedicated to the Memory of Jacob Liver.* Tel-Aviv 1972. Pp. 375–394.
- (1716c) MENAHEM STERN: The Jews in Greek and Latin Literature. In: SHMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions (= Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section 1: The Jewish People in the First Century).* Vol. 2. Philadelphia 1976. Pp. 1101–1159.
- (1716d) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (The Anchor Bible, 41).* Garden City, New York 1976.
- (1716e) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Manpower, Economics, and Internal Strife in the Hasmonean State. In: H. VAN EFFENTERRE, ed., *Colloques Nationaux du C.N.R.S. no. 936. Armées et Fiscalité dans le Monde Antique.* Paris 1977. Pp. 167–196.
- (1716f) BEN ZION LURIA (LURIE): Comments on the 'Scroll of the Sanctuary' (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 74, 1978, pp. 370–386.

ABEL and STARCKY (1708) follow HÖLSCHER (1709) in identifying Josephus' source for the Maccabean uprising as Nicolaus of Damascus. HÖLSCHER assumed that Josephus had no critical powers and that there was an anonymous intermediary between Nicolaus and Josephus, who had anti-Herodian and pro-Hasmonean views; but, as MOMIGLIANO (1710) correctly stresses, there is no evidence for such a hypothesis.

LAQUEUR (1711)(1712), in his effort to explain the differences between the accounts of Herod in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities', comes to the extreme and unjustified conclusion that Josephus did not employ Nicolaus directly in those sections of the 'Antiquities' which parallel the 'War', since for this portion he regards the 'Antiquities' as having no independent value save for the study of Josephus' own development and motives. He says that Nicolaus was the primary source for the 'War', but that with the passage of time Josephus became more nationalistic, and as a result took a more critical view of the later Hasmoneans

and of Herod, whom he held responsible for the loss of Jewish independence. Josephus, therefore, he says, in the 'Antiquities', deliberately altered the account of Nicolaus which he had copied so faithfully in the 'War'.

SHUTT (1713) shows, against HÖLSCHER, that Josephus does have a critical faculty and, against LAQUEUR, that Nicolaus was the main source for 'Antiquities' 15–17; he explains the passages critical of Herod and of Nicolaus as being due to the second edition of the 'Antiquities', composed after the death of Agrippa II; and he notes that Antiquities 16. 395–404, containing critical reflections on Herod's domestic tragedies, are missing from the Latin translation and may have been added later. But, we may comment, even during the lifetime of Agrippa II he could have written thus, since Agrippa regarded himself as more a Hasmonean than a Herodian.

STERN (1714) says that HÖLSCHER may be right in postulating Nicolaus as the source for the account in the 'Antiquities' of John Hyrcanus and his successors. Nicolaus, he says, was probably, as a partisan of Herod, anti-Hasmonean, as we see in Josephus' treatment of Alexander Jannaeus, whereas the version of Maccabean history in the 'War' is fairly positive. We may respond by noting that there is no evidence that Nicolaus was Josephus' main source for Jannaeus; and, in any case, as Josephus shows through his thorough rewriting of the 'Letter of Aristaeas', he did not copy slavishly but revised, presumably tendentiously, what he found.

WACHOLDER (1715) argues that Nicolaus was Josephus' source not only for the Maccabean and Herodian periods but for earlier Jewish history as well. He says that in the 'Antiquities' Josephus followed Nicolaus more closely than in the 'War' and hypothesizes that in the 'Antiquities' Josephus supplemented his account with citations from Nicolaus which dealt with general rather than with Jewish history. But, as STERN (1716) correctly comments, it is precisely in the 'Antiquities' that Josephus consciously tries to free himself from the panegyric approach of Nicolaus to Herod, and we must therefore conclude that he there used Nicolaus more critically than in the 'War'. As to Josephus' alleged use of Nicolaus for earlier Jewish history, Nicolaus' interest in the earlier period is, so far as the few extant fragments indicate, based on his connection with his native city of Damascus. It would seem strange for Josephus, learned as he claimed to be, to use a non-Jewish source for the Biblical period, except occasionally to provide external evidence for the historicity of its narrative. As for the period of the Second Temple, STERN appositely suggests that Josephus may have been attracted to the work of a man who, like himself, had been accused of time-serving and had written an autobiography defending himself. That Josephus was indeed heavily dependent on Nicolaus seems clear from the fact that once he reaches the period no longer covered by Nicolaus' work Josephus' own work becomes meager indeed, except for the long digressions on Asinaeus and Anilaus, on the assassination of Caligula, and on Izates, where he presumably had special sources.

STERN (1716a) notes that when Josephus draws upon Nicolaus for details about the Hasmoneans, as in his portrait of Aristobulus I and Hyrcanus II, he is more negative than is Strabo.

STERN (1716b) asserts that Nicolaus of Damascus was Josephus' main source for the history of Herod in the 'War' but that sometimes Josephus evaluated certain aspects of Herod's policy in the light of a hostile tradition derived from some of the descendants of Herod and Mariamne. When he later wrote the 'Antiquities', Josephus, though still dependent primarily upon Nicolaus, became more critical of him. In the thirteenth book of the 'Antiquities' Josephus was still chiefly dependent upon Nicolaus, as we can see from his sympathetic attitude toward the Hellenistic cities in their fight against the Hasmoneans and from his toning down of the achievements of the Hasmoneans. STERN does not see here a Jewish source for Josephus except for the portion on Judah the Essene. He perceives here all the signs of dramatic Hellenistic historiography.

STERN (1716c), p. 1137–1139, reasserts that Josephus took from Nicolaus both his factual material and, to a great extent, his point of view. Josephus' dependence upon Nicolaus, who was secretary to Herod and was hostile to the Hasmoneans, explains the odd fact that despite his national pride and his family connections with the Hasmonean dynasty, he is unsympathetic toward such major Hasmonean rulers as Aristobulus I, Alexander Jannaeus, and Salome Alexandra.

GOLDSTEIN (1716d), pp. 55–61, rejects the view of HÖLSCHER (1709) that Josephus drew his sketch of Hasmonean history in the 'War' from Nicolaus, since he finds the traces of polemic interests in the Jewish sources too strong.

BAR-KOCHVA (1716e) suggests that Nicolaus, in his account of John Hyrcanus taking 3000 talents out of David's tomb, was exaggerating in order to serve the interests of his Maecenas Herod, who followed Hyrcanus' example. This is implied by Josephus' criticism of Nicolaus (Ant. 16. 179–187). He concludes that Josephus used only Nicolaus in writing the history of the Hasmonean state in the 'War', and that it was Nicolaus, whose purpose was to mar the image of the Hasmoneans, who misled Josephus into writing that the maintenance of mercenaries by the Hasmoneans required special unpopular measures. He asserts that the anecdote (Ant. 13. 322) about Alexander Jannaeus' banishment to Galilee was drawn from Nicolaus and inspired by the Oedipus story, but this seems extravagant, though, as we have suggested above, Josephus' treatment of Solomon may have been influenced by the Oedipus narrative. BAR-KOCHVA claims that Josephus' elliptical and inconsistent description of the invasion of Galilee by Ptolemy Lathyrus at the beginning of Jannaeus' reign may be attributed to Nicolaus, his main source.

LURIA (LURIE) (1716f) argues that Josephus' source for his information concerning the Hasmoneans is Nicolaus of Damascus, who, as a foreigner, knew nothing about Israel's Torah and its laws of purity and impurity. As a Hellenist Nicolaus was ill-disposed toward the Hasmoneans, who had been eager to destroy Hellenistic culture. Nicolaus never realized that it was the aim of the Hasmonean wars to remove heathen impurities from the land. We may remark that the chief reason why Nicolaus was negatively disposed toward the Hasmoneans was that he was the secretary of Herod, who was their bitter enemy. Again, we may add, while it is true that Nicolaus was not a Jew, it is

clear that he made a considerable study of Judaism, since he was from time to time called upon to defend Jewish particularistic ways.

### 18.13: Strabo

- (1717) WOLFGANG ALY: Strabon von Amaseia. Strabonis Geographica, Bd. 4. Bonn 1957.
- (1718) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: Josephus and Strabo. In his: Studies in Josephus. London 1961. Pp. 106–109.
- (1719) MENAHEM STERN: Josephus Flavius' Method of Writing History (in Hebrew). In: Seventh Congress of the Israel Historical Society. Historians and Historical Schools. Jerusalem 1962. Pp. 22–28.
- (1719a) MENAHEM STERN: Strabo's Remarks on the Jews (in Hebrew). In: M. DORMAN, SHMUEL SAFRAI, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., In Memory of Gedaliahu Alon, Essays in Jewish History and Philology. Tel-Aviv 1970. Pp. 169–191. Rpt. in: MENAHEM STERN, ed. for Historical Society of Israel: Hellenistic Views on Jews and Judaism. Jerusalem 1974. Pp. 163–185. Summary in English by MERVYN LEWIS in: Immanuel 1, 1972, pp. 42–44.
- (1720) EDWARD R. LEVENSON: New Tendentious Motifs in *Antiquities*: A Study of Development in Josephus' Historical Thought. Diss., M.A., Columbia University, New York 1966.

ALY (1717), pp. 165–170, comments on Strabo as a source for Josephus' chronology of the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey (War 1. 146) and Herod (Ant. 14. 487).

SHUTT (1718), noting that all of the references to Strabo are confined to three books, plausibly concludes that Strabo was used as a subsidiary source to supplement the meager materials which Josephus had at his disposal between the end of his use of I Maccabees (Ant. 13. 214) and the beginning of his account of Herod's reign.

STERN (1719) concludes that in addition to using Nicolaus of Damascus Josephus also used Strabo, though he made no attempt to reconcile the differences between them (for example with regard to the reign of Aristobulus I [Ant. 13. 301, 319]).

STERN (1719a) asserts that Josephus has drawn much more material from Strabo than he indicates. Strabo, he says, had a more balanced view of the Hasmoneans than did Nicolaus. Thus, his accounts of Aristobulus I and Hyrcanus II were definitely more favorable than were Nicolaus'. Josephus in the 'Antiquities' (14. 487) repeats Strabo's mistake in stating that Pompey conquered Jerusalem on a fast day and not on the Sabbath; but in the 'War' (1. 146), where he presumably used Nicolaus as a source, he does not make this mistake. We may comment that, on the one hand, there is no proof that Josephus used Nicolaus more as his source for the 'War' than for the 'Antiquities'; and, in any case, since he wrote the former earlier, it seems more likely that the 'Antiquities' would be more accurate. On the other hand, by the 'Fast' (νηστεία) Strabo probably meant 'abstention' (i.e. from work), in other words, the Sabbath. Josephus has simply copied Strabo's word.

LEVENSON (1720), p. 38, suggests that Josephus appended the passage from Antiquities 13. 318–319 as a revision to express his new tendentiousness. But, we may comment, though we will admit that Josephus was not a mere compiler, the citations from Strabo are inconclusive on this point.

#### 18.14: Dionysius of Halicarnassus

- (1721) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: Josephus the Man and the Historian. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (1722) AHARON KAMINKA: Josephus and His Undertaking (in Hebrew). In his: Critical Writings. New York 1944. Pp. 57–79.
- (1723) GERT AVENARIUS: Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung. Meisenheim/Glan 1956.
- (1724) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: Josephus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In his: Studies in Josephus. London 1961. Pp. 92–101.
- (1725) HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE: The Presentation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Ph.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1975. Publ. as: The Interpretation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Missoula, Montana 1976.
- (1726) DAVID ALTSHULER: Descriptions in Josephus' Antiquities of the Mosaic Constitution. Diss., Ph.D., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1976.
- (1726a) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: Studies in the Language and Historiography of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Ph.D., Brown University, Providence 1976.

THACKERAY (1721), pp. 56–58, notes several parallels between Josephus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the rhetorician and historian who lived earlier in the first century. In particular, one is struck by the parallel titles of their respective great works, the 'Roman Antiquities' and the 'Jewish Antiquities', both in the same number of books, twenty.

KAMINKA (1722) accepts THACKERAY's suggestion of the parallel but adds no new examples of parallel motifs or language. But, we may comment, THACKERAY is not very successful himself in noting specific parallels in language and style; and his parallel between Josephus' account of the death of Moses and Dionysius' account of the death of Romulus is hardly close: one could just as easily cite the parallel with the death of Oedipus in Sophocles' 'Oedipus at Colonus'. In saying "Let each of my readers think as he will", Josephus may well be going back to Dionysius, as THACKERAY asserts; but as Lucian, *Quomodo historia conscribenda sit*, 60, has shown, the phrase is a commonplace and need not necessarily come from Dionysius. Indeed, AVENARIUS (1723) shows how common the motif is. In general, we may add, since Dionysius was such an admirer of his fellow-townsmen Herodotus and to a somewhat lesser degree Thucydides, we should look for the same motifs in these earlier historians.

SHUTT (1724) is more specific and more extensive in citing a number of poetical words, ἄπαξ λεγόμενα, abstract nouns, Thucydidean reminiscences, the use of καὶ οὐ for οὐτε, the use of participles in the same sentence with an unexpected and unnecessary change of tense, and the use of ἴδιος in place of the reflexive pronoun, all of which are characteristic of both Dionysius and Josephus. The final word will not be spoken, however, until the completion of

RENGSTORF's concordance and further lexicographical, grammatical, and stylistic studies have been made of the words of both authors. In general, one must say that considering the sheer bulk of Dionysius and of Josephus the number of examples thus far collected has been relatively meager, and the number of examples of close similarity of themes is small indeed. The fact, of course, that Josephus does not mention Dionysius is no proof one way or the other. Finally, the attempt to prove that Josephus' principles of historiography go back to the precepts in Dionysius' treatises of literary criticism has been fruitless because, as AVENARIUS has shown, such conventions are generally commonplace.

ATTRIDGE (1725) stresses that Josephus adopted certain types of language from Hellenistic historiography, notably Dionysius, because of their suitability for expressing important religious aspects of the Jewish religion. In particular, he discusses the use of the theme of divine providence and the ethical implications of political discussion, especially in Dionysius.

ALTSHULER (1726) considers the influence on Josephus' portrayal of Judaism of non-Biblical sources, notably Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

LADOUCEUR (1726a) criticizes SHUTT (1724) for exaggerating the influence of Dionysius upon Josephus. The fact, he correctly notes, that two writers use the same words is not conclusive evidence of borrowing, especially if the words are not limited to those authors. He notes that of the forty-seven words listed as peculiar to Dionysius and Josephus, about half occur in the Septuagint or in other Greek translations of the Bible. In addition, in the parallel passages cited by SHUTT, the meanings are sometimes different. SHUTT paid insufficient attention to Greek contemporary with Josephus and was too dependent upon the lexicon of LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES, which is inadequate for the Hellenistic period. There are also important differences between Josephus and Dionysius in the contexts of the passages containing the formula "Let each man judge for himself". Moreover, the similarities in grammar are not limited to Dionysius and Josephus. One could prove Josephus' dependence upon Polybius by almost all of these criteria. We may comment that now that we are well on our way to having a complete concordance to Josephus and when we shall have the "Thesaurus Linguae Graecae" (which will extend to the Byzantine period) we shall be in a good position to decide the question of dependence, at least so far as vocabulary is concerned. [See *infra*, p. 935.]

### 18.15: 'Longinus'

- (1727) KONRAT ZIEGLER: Das Genesiszitat in der Schrift ΠΕΡΙ ΥΨΟΥΣ. In: *Hermes* 50, 1915, pp. 572-603.
- (1728) KONRAD BURDACH: Der Gral. Forschungen über seinen Ursprung und seinen Zusammenhang mit der Longinuslegende (Forschungen zur Kirchen- und Geistesgeschichte, vol. 14). Stuttgart 1938.
- (1729) EDUARD NORDEN: Das Genesiszitat in der Schrift vom Erhabenen (Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Klasse für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, 1954, no. 1). Berlin 1955.

- (1730) G. P. GOOLD: A Greek Professorial Circle at Rome. In: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 92, 1961, pp. 168–192.

The work 'On the Sublime' traditionally ascribed to Longinus and dating presumably from the first century is the first and, indeed, for several centuries only pagan work that quotes (*On the Sublime* 9. 9), or actually paraphrases, a passage from the Bible. Many attempts, inspired by this citation, have been made to establish its relationship to Jewish writers, especially since the author is one of the very few Roman writers favorably disposed toward the Jews (for he praises the style of *Genesis* 1. 3–10).

ZIEGLER (1727) cites parallels between 'Longinus' and *Antiquities* 1. 15 and 1. 22–24.

BURDACH (1728), pp. 228–231, discusses the three people named Longinus in Josephus (a Roman tribune, *War* 2. 544; a Roman trooper, *War* 5. 312; Cassius Longinus, a Roman quaestor, *War* 1. 180 et passim). To these should be added a fourth, Titus Pompeius Longinus (*Ant.* 14. 229, 238). He concludes that the name Longinus does not come first from the 'Acta Pilati' ('Gospel of Nicodemus') of the fifth century but from Josephus or from his sources.

NORDEN (1729) cites more parallels both with Philo and Josephus. He suggests that the philosopher of chapter 44 of the treatise is Philo and dates the essay in 41, the year in which Philo headed the Alexandrian Jewish delegation to Caligula in Rome. He could just as easily, we might comment, have identified 'Longinus' with Philo himself, since there are a number of similarities in their choice of words.

GOOLD (1730) properly objects to NORDEN's daring hypothesis and notes that the citation from *Genesis* in 'Longinus' is paralleled by the surprisingly close wording in Josephus (*Ant.* 1. 27). When examined more closely, however, this parallel, as indeed the others mentioned by NORDEN, is hardly distinctive. Josephus, in his interest in improving his style, may have studied 'Longinus', but if so the influence on his style and vocabulary is not great.

### 18.16: The Testament (Assumption) of Moses

- (1731) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: The Testament of Moses: Its Content, Its Origin, and Its Attestation in Josephus. In: GEORGE W. E. NICKELSBURG, JR., *Studies on the Testament of Moses* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 4). Cambridge, Mass. 1973. Pp. 44–52.
- (1731a) DAVID M. RHOADS: The Assumption of Moses and Jewish History: 4 B.C.–A.D. 48. In: GEORGE W. E. NICKELSBURG, JR., ed., *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers* (Society of Biblical Literature, Pseudepigrapha Group, 1973). Missoula, Montana 1973. Pp. 53–58.
- (1731b) FRANCIS LOFTUS: The Martyrdom of the Galilean Troglodytes (B.J. i. 312–3; A. xiv. 429–30). A Suggested Traditionsgeschichte. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 66, 1976, pp. 212–223.

GOLDSTEIN (1731) notes that in *War* 4. 288, Josephus says that there was an ancient prophecy that Jerusalem would be subject to civil strife, and that Jews would first defile the Temple, which would be burnt by the Jews' opponents.

Although, says Josephus, the Zealots did not disbelieve this, they voluntarily fulfilled it. GOLDSTEIN suggests that Josephus' basis for this saying, otherwise unknown, was the 'Testament of Moses' (which he dates in 167/166 B.C.E.), which predicts that high priests will defile the Temple, that there will be dissension in Jerusalem (5. 2–6), and that part of the Temple will be burnt (6. 9). GOLDSTEIN finds another allusion to the Testament in Antiquities 12. 256, which mentions crucifixion as a punishment for violating the ban on circumcision, a fact not found in Josephus' presumed source, I Maccabees, but to be found in the Testament of Moses 8. 1. We may comment that the motifs of predictions *ex eventu*, and especially the language, are not sufficiently distinctive to make a case for borrowing. Crucifixion as a punishment seems merely to be Josephus' Romanization of his narrative.

RHOADS (1731a) objects to SCHÜRER's view that the author of the 'Assumption of Moses' was a Zealot. Such a conclusion is due to the fact that SCHÜRER found it impossible to place him within the other three sects and is based upon the outmoded view that first-century Judaism was divided into merely four sects. He says that the closest parallel to Taxo, who in the work (9. 1–7) prefers death to active resistance for himself and his seven sons, is the Jews who bared their throats to Pilate's henchmen in protest against the introduction of the imperial standards into Jerusalem (War 2. 174). A more likely parallel, we may suggest, is the story of Hannah and her seven sons (II Maccabees 7).

LOFTUS (1731b) concludes that Josephus' account (War 1. 312–313 and Ant. 14. 429–430) of the Galilean rebel who in 37 B.C.E. killed his seven sons, wife, and himself so as to avoid capture by Herod has a closer parallel in the account of Taxo and his seven sons in the 'Assumption of Moses' (9. 1–7) than in the account of the martyrdom of the mother and her seven sons in II Maccabees 7 and IV Maccabees. Both branches of the tradition, says LOFTUS, probably stem from a folktale influenced by Jeremiah 15. 9. Josephus, he says, may have been influenced by either the Maccabean version or by the 'Assumption of Moses', though it is highly unlikely that Josephus was influenced directly by II Maccabees. We may, however, comment that the only parallels are that Taxo had seven sons and that he told them to die rather than to transgress commands of G-d; in fact, in Josephus there is no religious element but only a political aspect.

#### 18.17: Philo (see also 2.15)

- (1732) HOWARD L. GOODHART and ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: A General Bibliography of Philo Judaeus. In: ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus. Practice and Theory*. New Haven 1938. Pp. 125–348.
- (1733) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Scholarship on Philo and Josephus (1937–1962)*. New York 1963.
- (1734) EARLE HILGERT: A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1963–1970. In: *Studia Philonica* 1, 1972, pp. 57–71.



- (1735) EARLE HILGERT: A Bibliography of Philo Studies in 1971 with Additions for 1963–1970. In: *Studia Philonica* 2, 1973, pp. 51–54. [See *infra*, p. 936.]
- (1736) EMIL SCHÜRER, rev.: HEINRICH BLOCH, *Die Quellen des Josephus*. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 4, 1879, pp. 567–572.
- (1737) NORMAN BENTWICH: *Philo-Judaeus of Alexandria*. Philadelphia 1910.
- (1738) MOSES HADAS: *A History of Greek Literature*. New York 1950.
- (1739) JACQUES C. MÉNARD: *Philon d'Alexandrie . . . III: Les rapports de Philon avec le judaïsme palestinien et Josèphe*. In: LOUIS PIROT, ANDRÉ ROBERT, HENRI CAZELLES, ANDRÉ FEUILLET, edd., *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*. Vol. 7, 1966, pp. 1299–1304.
- (1740) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *Moses*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 16.1, 1935, cols. 359–375.
- (1741) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *Josephus' Method in the Presentation of Jewish Antiquities (in Hebrew)*. In: *Zion* 5, 1940, pp. 180–203.
- (1742) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *The Methods of the Aggadah (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem 1949–50, 1954, 1970.
- (1743) A. D. DOYLE: *Pilate's Career and the Date of the Crucifixion*. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 42, 1941, pp. 190–193.
- (1744) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD, ed.: *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium*. Leiden 1961.
- (1745) PIETER J. SIJPESTEIJN: *The Legationes ad Gaium*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 15, 1964, pp. 87–96.
- (1746) JOHANN A. B. LUTTERBECK: *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe oder Untersuchungen über das Zeitalter der Religionswende, die Vorstufen des Christenthums und die erste Gestaltung desselben. Ein Handbuch für älteste Dogmengeschichte und systematische Exegese des neuen Testaments*. Vol. 2. Mainz 1852.
- (1747) CARL SIEGFRIED: *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testaments*. Jena 1875.
- (1748) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans.: *Josephus*, vol. 4, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books I–IV (Loeb Classical Library). London 1930.
- (1749) SALOMO RAPPAPORT: *Agada und Exegese bei Flavius Josephus*. Wien 1930.
- (1750) JEAN DANÉLOU: *La symbolique du temple de Jérusalem chez Philon et Josèphe*. In: *Le symbolisme cosmique des monuments religieux. Actes de la conférence internationale qui a eu sous les auspices de l'Is. M.E.O. à Rome, Avril–Mai 1955 (Série orientale, no. 14)*. Roma, Istituto italiano per il medio ed estremo oriente 1957. Pp. 83–90.
- (1751) URSULA FRÜCHTEL: *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Genesisexegese*. Leiden 1968.
- (1752) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *The Menorah among the Jews of the Roman World*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23.2, 1950–51, pp. 449–492.
- (1753) MARTIN MCNAMARA: *The New Testament and the Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch*. Rome 1966.
- (1754) LOUIS GINZBERG: *The Legends of the Jews*. Vol. 6. Philadelphia 1928.
- (1755) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *By Light, Light*. New Haven 1935.
- (1756) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. Vol. 4, New York 1954. Vol. 8, New York 1958.
- (1757) JOSHUA AMIR: *Explanations of Hebrew Names in Philo (in Hebrew)*. In: *Tarbiz* 31, 1961–62, p. 297.
- (1758) A. HANSON: *Philo's Etymologies*. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 18, 1967, pp. 128–139.
- (1759) JULIEN WEILL, ed.: *Antiquités judaïques, Livres I–V*. In: THÉODORE REINACH, ed., *Œuvres complètes de Flavius Josèphe traduits en français*. Paris 1900.
- (1760) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *Philo's Place in Judaism: A Study of Conceptions of Abraham in Jewish Literature*. Cincinnati 1956.
- (1761) DIETER GEORGI: *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief. Studien zur religiösen*

- Propaganda in der Spätantike (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 11). Neukirchen 1964. Esp. pp. 83–187.
- (1762) GÉZA VERMÈS: La figure de Moïse au tournant des Deux Testaments. In: HENRI CAZELLES et al., *Moïse l'homme de l'alliance*. Paris 1955. P. 88.
- (1763) WAYNE A. MEEKS: The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 14). Leiden 1967.
- (1764) DAVID L. TIEDE: The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker. Diss., Ph. D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1970. Published (Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series, no. 1): Missoula, Montana 1972.
- (1765) FRANÓS H. COLSON and GEORGE H. WHITAKER, edd. and trans.: *Philo*. 10 volumes (Loeb Classical Library). London 1929–62.
- (1766) FRANÓS H. COLSON, ed. and trans.: *Philo*, vol. 6 (Loeb Classical Library). London 1935.
- (1767) ISIDORE LÉVY: *La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*. Paris 1927.
- (1768) ISIDORE LÉVY: *Recherches esséniennes et pythagoriciennes* (Centres de recherches d'histoire et de philologie de la IVe section de l'École pratique des hautes études, III: Hautes études du monde gréco-romain, 1). Genève 1965.
- (1769) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung*. Breslau 1932; rpt. Hildesheim 1962.
- (1770) SAMUEL BELKIN: *Philo and the Oral Law* (Harvard Semitic Series, 11). Cambridge, Mass. 1940.
- (1771) FRANÓS H. COLSON, ed. and trans.: *Philo*, vol. 9 (Loeb Classical Library). London 1941.
- (1771a) WILFRED L. KNOX: Pharisaism and Hellenism. In: HERBERT M. J. LOEWE, ed., *The Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures*. London 1937; rpt. New York 1969. Pp. 59–111.
- (1771b) BERTIL GÄRTNER: *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*. Trans. by CAROLYN H. KING. Diss. Uppsala (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, 21). Uppsala 1955.
- (1771c) ARNO BORST: *Der Turmbau von Babel. Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*. 4 vols. Stuttgart 1957–63.
- (1771d) VICTOR C. PFITZNER: *Paul and the Agon Motif. Traditional Athletic Imagery in Pauline Literature*. Leiden 1967.
- (1771e) R. J. MCKELVEY: *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford Theological Monographs, vol. 3). Oxford 1969.
- (1771f) ANTONIO V. NAZZARO: *Recenti studi filoniani* (1963–70). Napoli s. a. [1973].
- (1771g) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, trans. and ed.: *Les Œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*, 32: *Legatio ad Gaium*, Paris 1972.
- (1771h) BERNARD S. JACKSON: *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 10, ed. JACOB NEUSNER). Leiden 1975.
- (1771i) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction*. New York 1979.
- (1771j) PER BILDE: The Roman Emperor Gaius (Caligula)'s Attempt to Erect His Statue in the Temple of Jerusalem. In: *Studia Theologica* 32, 1978, pp. 67–93.
- (1771k) DAVID M. HAY: What Is Proof? – Rhetorical Verification in Philo, Josephus, and Quintilian. In: PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, vol. 2. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 87–100.
- (1771l) JAMES E. CROUCH: The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 109). Diss. Tübingen. Published: Göttingen 1972.
- (1771m) CLEMENS THOMA: *Christliche Theologie des Judentums*. Aschaffenburg 1978.

There is hardly an author for whom we have such exhaustive bibliographies as for Philo. GOODHART and GOODENOUGH (1732) cover the period until 1937,

subdividing the field into many areas, though without annotations. I (1733) continue this work through 1962, with further subdivisions and with annotations. HILGERT (1734) (1735) (1735a) (1735b) (1735c) (1735d) brings the work up through 1978, though without annotations. And yet, none of these bibliographical studies has an entry on the relationship of Josephus to Philo; and one must search through them for brief scattered references to the subject.

*A priori* one would assume that Josephus used the work of Philo, who died when Josephus was a child, as a source for certain political events also described by Philo, for his interpretation of the Bible in the first half of the 'Antiquities', and for the survey of Jewish law in the third and fourth books of the Antiquities and in the second book of 'Against Apion'. Actually Josephus mentions Philo in only one passage (Ant. 18. 259–260), where he refers to him as "no novice in philosophy" and as the head of a delegation of Alexandrian Jews to the Emperor Caligula to answer the charges of Apion. He nowhere indicates that he used any of his works.

Most scholars who have dealt with the question assert that Josephus did use Philo's works. SCHÜRER (1736), for example, attempts to prove dependence. BENTWICH (1737), pp. 220–222, asserts that Josephus knew at least part of Philo's works, notably 'De Vita Mosis' and the 'Hypothetica'. HADAS (1738), pp. 237–239, says that Philo was one of Josephus' sources for the early books of the 'Antiquities' since both deal with Biblical exegesis. MÉNARD (1739) carefully explores their relations at some length.

Only HEINEMANN (1740), p. 375, among major modern scholars, finds no evidence for dependence. He (1741), upon comparing Josephus and Philo, concludes that both drew in general upon the same sources, both were apologetic, and both were positively disposed to Greek culture, but that they differed in that Philo adopted the allegorical method. HEINEMANN (1742) continues this contrast between Josephus and Philo, who, he stresses, was not an historian but a religious allegorist and an expounder of texts.

As already indicated, where Philo and Josephus cover the same historical incidents, there appear to be discrepancies. Thus Philo's account of the introduction of the aniconic shields by the procurator Pontius Pilate into Jerusalem differs from Josephus' version of the introduction of the standards with their images (Ant. 18. 55–59) in a number of respects, so that most scholars regard them as two distinct incidents, as DOYLE (1743) agrees.

Again there are discrepancies between Philo's account of the embassy to Gaius Caligula and that of Josephus (Ant. 18. 257–260). Thus, for example, Philo (Legatio 370) mentions that there were five Jewish envoys, whereas Josephus (Ant. 18. 257) says that there were three Jews and three Greeks. SMALLWOOD (1744) for good reason declares a preference for Philo since he was a participant; Josephus' account, she says, has fairy-tale elements, and Josephus' chronology is unacceptable. SIJPESTEIJN (1745) suggests that Josephus' statement that there were three Jewish envoys may be due to the fact that he knew that Isidoros and Lampon were in Rome in 38 to bring an action against the deposed prefect Flaccus, and that they were joined by the notorious Apion; hence he concluded that there must have been three Jewish envoys as well.

Similarities between Philo and Josephus in their philosophical and religious teachings were already noted by LUTTERBECK (1746).

SIEGFRIED (1747), in particular, followed by THACKERAY (1748), p. xiii, notes how closely the preface to the 'Antiquities' (1. 1–17) resembles Philo's introduction to 'De Opificio Mundi' (1–12).

RAPPAPORT (1749) is sure that Josephus used Philo for his interpretation of the Bible. Both Philo (*De Opificio Mundi* 1–3) and Josephus (*Ant.* 1. 21), for example, offer substantially the same reason why the account of creation precedes that of the giving of the commandments in the Torah, namely to mould the minds to obedience of those who were to receive the laws. A similar view, we may comment, is found in the Talmudic-Midrashic tradition (cf. Tanḥuma Bereshith [ed. BUBER] 11; Midrash Song of Songs Rabbah 1 on 1. 4; Genesis Rabbah 1. 2); and both may have derived it from there.

Josephus shares with Philo, as DANÉLOU (1750) and FRÜCHTEL (1751), pp. 98–100, have shown, an allegorical interpretation of the Bible, so that, for example, they look upon the divisions of the Tabernacle (*Ant.* 3. 181; cf. Philo, *Quaestiones in Exodum* 2. 85, *De Vita Mosis* 2. 88) into three parts as symbolic of earth, the sea, and heaven; the twelve loaves of shewbread as symbolic of the twelve months (*Ant.* 3. 182; cf. Philo, *De Specialibus Legibus* 1. 172); the seven-branched candlestick as symbolic of the seven planets (*Ant.* 3. 182; cf. Philo, *Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres* 45–46; *Quaestiones in Exodum* 2. 73, 75); the four materials of which the tapestries were woven as symbols of the four elements (*Ant.* 3. 183; cf. Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2. 88, *Quaestiones in Exodum* 2. 85); the high priest's garments as symbolic of earth, heaven, lightning, the ocean, sun, moon, the signs of the zodiac, etc. (*Ant.* 3. 184–187; cf. Philo, *Quaestiones in Exodum* 2. 112–114, 117–120).

GOODENOUGH (1752) concludes that Philo and Josephus present allegories of the menorah to integrate the current astralism into Judaism. He notes that Josephus agrees with Philo in interpreting the Tabernacle in cosmic terms but that he disagrees in details. But, we may comment, allegory was widespread both in the Greek and Jewish traditions at the time of Josephus; and parallels to some of these interpretations may be found not only in Philo, but also in rabbinic midrashim and in Targum Jonathan, as McNAMARA (1753), pp. 194–195, remarks, and even, as THACKERAY (1748), p. 403, note b, indicates, in the Samaritan liturgy.

And yet, despite GOODENOUGH, there is no conclusive evidence that Josephus is setting forth a common interpretation of the Menorah, since the fact that it appears in the rabbinic midrashim indicates rabbinic, and not necessarily popular, knowledge.

The fact that in some of their symbolic interpretations Philo and Josephus stand alone, as GINZBERG (1754), p. 68, note 353, points out, is, we may comment, seemingly strong evidence of Josephus' knowledge of Philo, though it is always possible that Josephus had access to now-lost midrashim. Still, as GOODENOUGH (1755), p. 99, (1756), vol. 4, pp. 82 and 86–88, and vol. 8, pp. 212–213, comments, even here, in the symbolic explanation of the priestly cult, where there are some striking agreements, there are also so many details

where there is disagreement that Josephus seems to have used another source as well. Perhaps, we may suggest, they both drew on a common source. The fact, beautifully illustrated by GOODENOUGH, that Jewish art of this period shows such symbolic interpretations would indicate that these interpretations are not personal ones but rather were widely current. Hence we must disagree with McNAMARA (1753), who thinks that the symbolism represents the influence of Hellenism on the learned class rather than on everyday Judaism: indeed, the appearance of such motifs in art shows that they reflect what GOODENOUGH has called popular Judaism.

The fact that Josephus and Philo have similar interpretations of such proper names as Abel (Ant. 1. 52; Philo, *De migratione Abrahami* 74) and Ishmael (Ant. 1. 190; Philo, *De mutatione nominum* 202), which SIEGFRIED (1747) also cites as indicating borrowing, may be due, we may reply, to mutual dependence on onomastica such as have been found in Egypt and described by AMIR (1757) and HANSON (1758).

THACKERAY (1748), p. 88, note a, following WEILL (1759), calls attention to what he terms a striking parallel between Antiquities 1. 177 and Philo, *De Abrahamo* 233, describing Abraham's rout of the Assyrians. Philo, like Josephus, in an extra-Biblical detail, says that Abraham attacked at night while the men were preparing to go to sleep, slaying some in their beds. But, as SANDMEL (1760), p. 64, has commented, Philo does not speak, as does Josephus, of the drunkenness of the Assyrians nor of those who flee, and, above all, Philo insists that Abraham trusted not in his small force but in G-d, whereas for Josephus it is a personal triumph of generalship by Abraham himself. In this respect Philo is closer to the rabbinic point of view, which stresses that Abraham's victory was really a victory for G-d. We may conclude by suggesting that both Philo and Josephus had access to earlier midrashic traditions; the differences in detail and in language are too great to warrant a hypothesis of borrowing. SANDMEL, pp. 59–77, notes a few other similarities between Philo and Josephus but wisely refrains from postulating dependence, and in this he is followed by GEORGI (1761), p. 96.

VERMÈS (1762) contends that Josephus' portrait of Moses is identical with the Palestinian tradition rather than with the Alexandrian Philonic tradition, though it is dressed in Greek.

MEEKS (1763), pp. 131–146, contends that the structure of the Moses story which was provided for Josephus by the Hellenistic tradition goes far beyond mere 'clothing'. He also contends that the Palestinian tradition itself was far from untouched by Greek influence. He notes similarities with Philo's version, particularly in Josephus' account of the end of Moses' life and in his account of Sinai; but he also remarks that Josephus, in contrast to Philo, denies to Moses the high priesthood and exalts Aaron at Moses' expense.

TIEDE (1764) asserts that Josephus is close to Philo in his portrayal of Moses in downgrading miraculous aspects and in ascribing to him virtues which are prized by non-Jews.

COLSON and WHITAKER (1765) in their notes call attention to a number of similarities between Philo and Josephus (see Index, vol. 10, p. 460, s.v. Jo-

sephus). To COLSON (1766), pp. 608–609, the parallel between Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2. 114 and 132 and *War* 5. 235 describing the inscription of the Tetragrammaton on the golden plate on the high priest's crown is "the strongest evidence I have yet seen of Josephus' use of his predecessor"; but we may comment that this agrees with the Biblical description (*Exodus* 28. 36–38, 39. 30–31), as amplified by the rabbis (*Shabbath* 63b). The fact that Philo and Josephus mention only the Tetragrammaton as being inscribed there is not necessarily inconsistent with the Biblical-Talmudic tradition, which mentions that the words "Holy to the L-rd" (Tetragrammaton) was there inscribed, since the key word is the Tetragrammaton, which is what Philo and Josephus focus upon. Moreover, Philo and Josephus are not unique in noting that the Tetragrammaton was inscribed there, for the Letter of Aristeas 98 has a similar indication. Since Josephus definitely knew Aristeas, as his close paraphrase (*Ant.* 12. 11–118) shows, he might have derived this from Aristeas, though, more likely, he is drawing upon personal knowledge as a priest, as well as on the Biblical statement.

Much discussion in recent years has centered on Josephus' indebtedness in Book 2 of 'Against Apion' to Philo's fragmentary 'Hypothetica'. LÉVY (1767), pp. 211–225, (1768), pp. 51–56, notes a number of similarities. He finds that both *Against Apion* 2. 213 and *Hypothetica* 7. 9 are similar to Pythagoreanism; we may comment, however, that what LÉVY calls Pythagoreanism he should term Neo-Pythagoreanism; and such a writer as Iamblichus may have been influenced indirectly by Philo. In addition, LÉVY notes similarities between *Against Apion* 2. 205 and Philo's *De Specialibus Legibus* 3. 205 and between *Against Apion* 2. 203 and *De Specialibus Legibus* 3. 63.

HEINEMANN (1769), pp. 529–530, denies that Josephus used Philo's 'Hypothetica', urging that the coincidences are not sufficiently numerous or distinctive to warrant such a conclusion: he prefers to postulate a common source when they agree.

BELKIN (1770), pp. 22–25, asserts that Philo knew more about Palestinian law than did Josephus: thus, for example, with regard to the Jubilee, which was no longer practiced in Palestine during his time, Josephus is wrong and Philo is right. As to 'Against Apion' and 'Hypothetica', either, he says, both are based on some Alexandrian source or the former is directly dependent on the latter. Thus, for example, in both of them the violation of any of the commandments is deemed a capital offense. Similarly, in *Against Apion* 2. 213, Josephus mentions a law which has no direct Biblical or Talmudic parallel, that Jews are forbidden to destroy animals which flee for refuge to one's home; there is an almost exact parallel in the 'Hypothetica'.

COLSON (1771), in his notes, especially p. 409, on the 'Hypothetica', independently remarks on the striking similarity between this work and 'Against Apion'. In addition to similarities in interpretations of points of Jewish law, COLSON, pp. 514–516, also cites similarities between Philo's account of the Essenes in the *Hypothetica* 11. 1–18 and *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 75–91 and Josephus' 'War', Book 2. That Josephus, however, we may conclude, did not use Philo as a source for the Essenes seems clear from the considerable

amount of additional detail in Josephus, as well as from some differences noted below in the discussion of the Essenes. In fact, since Josephus himself spent some time with the Essenes (Life 11), we may assume that his chief source was personal experience.

KNOX (1771a), p. 79, finds the symbolism of Aaron's robes (Ant. 3. 183ff.) as being parallel to Philo, *De Vita Mosis* 2. 117–135. The conception that the whole cosmos is the robe of G-d is Platonic and Stoic; the whole train of thought is alien to Judaism, but it is introduced to show that Judaism is aware of the truth that G-d is immanent in the whole of creation.

GÄRTNER (1771b), pp. 116–133, compares the concept of the knowledge of G-d in Philo, in the Wisdom of Solomon, and in Josephus. He finds (pp. 215–217) that Josephus (Apion 2. 190) uses the terms αὐτάρκεια, ἀταραξία, and ἀπάθεια in the same way as Plato and Philo.

BORST (1771c), vol. 1, pp. 170–173, concludes that Josephus sought through conjectures to emend the obscurities which Philo sought to explain through allegory. The table of nations in Josephus does not contain all contemporary peoples because the Bible for him has antiquarian rather than actual interest, and it is for him even less than for Philo the book of books.

PFITZNER (1771d), pp. 69–72, concludes that Josephus' usage of the vocabulary of athletic contests conforms to that of Hellenistic Judaism, as seen in Philo and in IV Maccabees. He declines to postulate dependence upon Philo, though we may indicate that the coincidences in their descriptions of the Essenes and in their application of symbolism to the Bible make such an hypothesis quite possible.

MCKELVEY (1771e) notes a parallel between Josephus (Apion 2. 193) and Philo (*De Specialibus Legibus* 1. 67), namely the argument that since G-d is one, there should also be only one Temple.

NAZZARO (1771f), pp. 76–77, discusses the relationship and differences between Josephus' 'Against Apion' and Philo's 'Hypothetica'.

PELLETIER (1771g), pp. 371–377, presents a systematic comparison between Philo and Josephus on the scandal of the shields. He attempts to reduce the difference by searching the indirect tradition, as represented especially by Origen and Eusebius. He concludes that Philo has presented in *Legatio ad Gaium* 299–302 the recollection of an episode during the procuratorship of Pilate which Josephus has ignored or has deliberately passed over in silence. We may, however, comment that Origen and Eusebius are elsewhere guilty of confusion in citing Josephus, and that they are of limited value in such a matter.

JACKSON (1771h) concludes that the account of Jewish law in Book 4 of the 'Antiquities' agrees with Philo in two basic characteristics: first, it is an account of Mosaic law that he declares that he provides, so that many of the supplementary issues which concerned the rabbis are not raised at all, and second, it is written with semi-apologetic objectives.

SANDMEL (1771i), pp. 23–24, sees no direct connection between Philo and Josephus, 'Against Apion' 2. He remarks that it is necessary to regard the 'Legum Allegoria' of Philo as a unified entity and something quite beyond the random, disparate, individual allegorical items found in Josephus and in rabbinic

literature. SANDMEL, p. 186, presumes that haggadic and halachic materials available to Josephus were likewise available to Philo; but we may remark that while this is possible it would appear that at best Philo had a useless knowledge of Hebrew and had little or no contact with the Palestinian rabbis, none of whom he mentions by name.

BILDE (1771j) notes that while Philo's portrait of Petronius is like that of his other schematic figures, Josephus' Petronius changes his character from being loyal to defying imperial orders and is thus more credible. As to chronology, Philo (*Legatio ad Gaium* 249) is inconsistent in speaking of crops and the fruits of trees (i.e. early and late summer) at the same time; Josephus, on the other hand, is not confused in setting the time as the summer of 40.

HAY (1771k) notes the similarity between Philo's 'In Flaccum' and Josephus' 'Against Apion' both in fundamental religious ideas and in types of apologetic argument. He considers the possibility that Josephus may have had some knowledge of the writings of Philo, but concludes that the similarities derive from the fact that both drew on a common body of Hellenistic Jewish apologetic and followed similar conventions of contemporary pagan rhetoric. Both works were intended primarily for pagans.

CROUCH (1771l), pp. 84–101, compares Josephus, 'Against Apion' with Philo's 'Hypothetica' and Pseudo-Phocylides.

THOMA (1771m), in a popular work, pp. 128–130, deals with Messianic theology in Josephus and Philo.

### 18.18: Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities'

- (1772) ABRAHAM SPIRO: Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judahites in Pseudo-Philo. In: *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 20, 1951, pp. 279–355.
- (1773) CAROLYN OSIEK and ED. REWOLINSKI: *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Pseudo-Philonis: The Joshua Narrative XX–XXIV*. In: *New Testament Seminar of Prof. JOHN STRUGNELL*, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. Fall 1971. No. 3. Unpublished.
- (1774) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Prolegomenon*. In reissue of: MONTAGUE R. JAMES, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. New York 1971. Pp. vii–clxix.
- (1775) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Epilegomenon to Pseudo-Philo's Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum (LAB)*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, 1974, pp. 305–312.
- (1776) JOSEPH HEINEMANN: 210 Years of Egyptian Exile: A Study in Midrashic Chronology. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 22, 1971, pp. 19–30.
- (1776a) ROGER LE DÉAUT: Aspects de l'intercession dans le Judaïsme ancien. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 1, 1970, pp. 35–57.

It is not possible to date precisely the original of the 'Biblical Antiquities' ascribed to Philo but almost surely not by him. Most scholars, however, assign a date in the first century, after the destruction of the Temple.

SPIRO (1772) notes that though Josephus has made a number of adjustments in his portrait of Joshua, his modifications, as compared with Pseudo-Philo's, are clumsy. He focusses, in particular, on Josephus' polemic against the Samaritans, which, he concludes, is sometimes in agreement with Pseudo-



Philo's and at other times not. SPIRO explains the differences between Josephus and Pseudo-Philo by suggesting that both may have drawn on many sources.

OSIEK and REWOLINSKI (1773) contrast Pseudo-Philo's tendentious alteration of events reflecting doctrinal considerations and Josephus' rather rigorous adherence to the Biblical account in his non-theologically motivated history.

I (1774), pp. lviii–lxvi, and (1775) have noted a total of thirty instances where parallels between Pseudo-Philo and Josephus are to be found in no other extant work (one correction may be noted: on p. lix, line 16, for *AJ* 9. 199ff. read *AJ* 4. 114ff.); in addition, I note fifteen cases where Josephus is not alone in agreeing with this work and where both may reflect a common tradition. To be sure, I also note thirty-six instances where they disagree. One such instance is discussed by HEINEMANN (1776), who notes that according to the Antiquities 2. 318, in agreement with *Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer* 48 (who explains the difference as being due to the fact that five years before Jacob descended to Egypt Menasseh and Ephraim, the ancestors of two tribes, were born to Joseph), the Israelites spent 215 years in Egypt, whereas according to the Biblical Antiquities 9. 3, as well as the Midrash (*Genesis Rabbah* 91. 2), they spent 210 years there. In this instance Josephus interestingly agrees with the Samaritan midrash 'Memar Marqah'.

In general, the 'Biblical Antiquities' agrees more with the rabbinic position than does Josephus. Though it would be a mistake to regard Josephus as Pseudo-Philo's source or vice versa, there are, we must assert, enough coincidences, some of them uncanny, to regard it as likely that both Josephus and the 'Biblical Antiquities' used a common source.

LE DÉAUT (1776a), pp. 41–46, notes the similarities between Josephus (*Ant.* 1. 96, 1. 222–236, and 11. 326) and Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' (33.5) on the subject of intervention with G-d through prayer in favor of someone.

### 18.19: Sallust

- (1777) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (1778) BENIAMIN NADEL: Józef Flawiusz a terminologia rzymskiej inwektywy politycznej (in Polish, with Latin summary: = Josephus Flavius and the Terminology of Roman Political Invektive). In: *Eos* 56, 1966, pp. 256–272.
- (1779) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Ph.D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.

THACKERAY (1777), pp. 119–120, had already compared briefly the blackened portrait of John of Gischala in Josephus (*War* 2. 585–589 and 4. 85) with Sallust's blackened portrait of Catiline (*De Catilinae Conjurazione* 5).

NADEL (1778) goes further and argues that Josephus drew upon Sallust and upon the orations of Cicero for his invective against the revolutionaries.

COHEN (1779), however, rightly remarks that Josephus is using stock formulae in describing political opponents, and that, in fact, he employs similar language not only for John but also for Jeroboam (*Ant.* 8. 209).

## 19: Josephus' Views on the Jewish Religion

### 19.0: Josephus' Outlook on Judaism: General

- (1780) JAMES A. MONTGOMERY: The Religion of Flavius Josephus. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 11, 1920–21, pp. 277–305.
- (1781) ADOLF SCHLATTER: *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus*. Gütersloh 1932.
- (1782) SIMON DAVIS: *Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt: Greek, Egyptian, Hebrew, Roman*. London 1951; New York 1952.
- (1783) WILHELM DITTMANN: *Die Auslegung der Urgeschichte (Genesis 1–3) im Neuen Testament*. Göttingen 1953 (microfilm).
- (1784) ALAN L. PONN: *The Relationship between Josephus' View of Judaism and His Conception of Political and Military Power*. Rabbinic thesis (typewritten). Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1961.
- (1785) NILS A. DAHL: *Das Volk Gottes. Eine Untersuchung zum Kirchenbewußtsein des Urchristentums*. 2nd ed., Darmstadt 1963.
- (1786) GERHARD DELLING: Josephus und die heidnischen Religionen. In: *Klio* 43–45, 1965, pp. 263–269.
- (1787) WALTER GRUNDMANN: *Das palästinensische Judentum im Zeitraum zwischen der Erhebung der Makkabäer und dem Ende des Jüdischen Krieges*. in: JOHANNES LEIPOLDT and WALTER GRUNDMANN, ed., *Umwelt des Urchristentums*. Vol. 1. Berlin 1965. Pp. 143–291.
- (1788) CLEMENS THOMA: *Die Weltanschauung des Josephus Flavius dargestellt anhand seiner Schilderung des jüdischen Aufstandes gegen Rom (66–73 n. Chr.)*. In: *Kairos* 11, 1969, pp. 39–52.
- (1789) EHRHARD KAMLAH: *Frömmigkeit und Tugend: Die Gesetzesapologie des Josephus in c Ap 2*, 145–295. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, ed., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 220–232.
- (1789a) GERHARD DELLING: *MONOC THEOC*. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 77, 1952, pp. 469–476.
- (1789b) FRITZ TAEGER: *Charisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*. 2 vols. Stuttgart 1957–60.
- (1789c) PAOLO SACCHI: *Storia del mondo giudaico (Manuali universitari 1: Per lo studio delle scienze dell'Antichità)*. Torino 1976.
- (1789d) SAMUEL SAFRAI: *The Jewish People in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew)*. Tel-Aviv 1970. Trans. into German by YEHOASHUA AMIR: *Das jüdische Volk im Zeitalter des Zweiten Tempels*. Neukirchen-Vluyn 1978.
- (1789e) DAVID FLUSSER: *The Jewish Religion in the Second Temple Period*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, ed., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (World History of the Jewish People, 1.8)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 3–40, 322–324.

- (1789f) PETER SCHÄFER: Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 15). Leiden 1978.
- (1789g) EMIL SCHÜRER: The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.—A.D. 135), revised ed. by GEZA VERMES, FERGUS MILLAR, and MATTHEW BLACK, vol. 2. Edinburgh 1979.
- (1789h) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: Flavius Josephus and the Mysteries. In: MAARTEN J. VERMASEREN, ed., Studies in Hellenistic Religions (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain, 78). Leiden 1979. Pp. 244–279.

For Josephus' religious views the general survey (sympathetic to Josephus) by MONTGOMERY (1780) which stresses Josephus' loyalty to Judaism is useful.

The most comprehensive survey of the subject is by SCHLATTER (1781), which has special consideration of Josephus' views of G-d, the chosen people, piety, justice, liberalism, the Pharisees, the Zealots, the Gnostics, Israel and the nations, and the world to come.

DAVIS (1782), pp. 163–164, in a manifest exaggeration, says that Josephus' summary of the principles of Judaism (Against Apion 2. 145–295) shows a masterly grasp of the spirit of true religion and an extraordinary philosophic outlook.

DITTMANN (1783), pp. 38–48, concludes that Josephus is strongly influenced in what he says and omits about creation and the fall of man by his own personality. Josephus, he correctly asserts, is an historian and not a theological exegete or philosopher; but, we must add, the fact that Josephus makes a point of telling us that he went through the three major sects (Life 10–12) and that he intended to write a work (Ant. 20. 268) on the reasons for the commandments in Judaism indicates his great interest in religious matters. DITTMANN fails to mention the significance of Josephus' use (Ant. 1. 27) of the word ἐκτίσεν for "he created" (implying *creatio ex nihilo*) in contrast to the Septuagint's ἐποίησεν (implying *creatio ex aliquo*) in Genesis 1. 1. He also fails to realize a major motive for Josephus' changes, namely, to present a Hellenized version intelligible and more readily acceptable to his Greek audience.

PONN (1784), in a disjointed work, concludes that Josephus utilized religious arguments in urging his fellow-countrymen to surrender to the Romans, since he regarded the rapid growth of Roman power as clear evidence that G-d favored them. He thus expressed in religious terms what he had already become convinced of in political terms. He says that the 'Antiquities' and 'Against Apion' are expressions of religious content which grew out of a political need to restore respectability and prestige to the Jews during the troubled era of Domitian. PONN does not go so far as to accuse Josephus of insincerity in doing this, but such a conclusion, we may say, is inevitable.

DAHL (1785), pp. 103–104, shows that whereas the Bible views Jewish history as *Heilsgeschichte*, Josephus (Ant. 1. 14, 19–20) views it as illustrating G-d's Providential control of history. He avoids (because of his relationship to his Roman patrons, we should add) eschatology as far as possible (Ant. 10. 210) and regards Messianic movements as bands of robbers.

DELLING (1786) notes that Josephus went along a tightrope balancing between tolerance toward other religions, in that he prohibits blaspheming pagan gods and pillaging their temples, and loyalty to Pharisaic Judaism, an effective policy in view of the difficult circumstances of the Jews following the destruction of the Temple. It is precisely, we may add, this kind of balancing act that characterized Josephus politically as well and enabled him, as a kind of Ilya Ehrenburg, to survive changes in emperors.

GRUNDMANN (1787) has a survey of the Jewish religion during this period for which he uses Josephus as a major source.

THOMA (1788) rightly comments on how difficult it is to evaluate Josephus' religious and philosophic views because of the polemic nature of his works and his insertion of himself into his writings. This is aggravated by the difference in orientation of his two major works, the 'War' being pro-Roman and the 'Antiquities' being pro-Jewish. THOMA's assertion, however, that Josephus tends to give events a Messianic interpretation is unfounded; in fact, Josephus deliberately avoids Messianic implications.

KAMLAH (1789) discusses the special combination of thorough Hellenism and Judaism in Josephus' concept of piety and virtue.

DELLING (1789a) presents a survey of the phrase *μύθος θεός* in Hellenistic Judaism, and particularly in Philo, Josephus, and the New Testament. This formula openly placed Judaism in opposition to pagan polytheism. Josephus (Ant. 8, 335, 337) shows the exclusiveness of the Jewish religion and her ethical demands.

TAAGER (1789b), vol. 2, pp. 559–561, concludes that Josephus participated in the beliefs and superstitions of his people and of his time. We may, however, remark that he is skeptical of miracles or, at least, sometimes leaves the matter to his readers.

SACCHI (1789c) presents a historical survey of the major themes of pre-Christian Jewish theology down to the time of Jesus. He stresses such topics as epistemology, fate and free will, ethical issues, the Messiah, salvation, the immortality of the soul, and the resurrection of the body.

SAFRAI (1789d) surveys the social and religious history of the Jews during the period between the return from the Babylonian captivity to the Arab conquest. He gives particular attention to proselytism, to Torah in the life of the people, to messianism, to prayer, and to the Temple cult.

FLUSSER (1789e) surveys the sources for our knowledge of religious trends during the period of the Second Temple and the major beliefs and practices.

SCHÄFER (1789f) has several essays on the beliefs of rabbinic Judaism in which a number of references are made to Josephus and to other extra-rabbinic sources.

The long-awaited second volume of the revised SCHÜRER (1789g) shows even more far-reaching revisions than did the first volume. Notable modifications have been made in the discussions of the languages of the Jews, Hellenistic cities, the priesthood and worship, the synagogue, Messianic beliefs, and the Essenes. The editors have made a special effort to remove SCHÜRER's

ignorance of and prejudice against rabbinic Halakhah. The bibliographies for each topic are unusually comprehensive.

VAN UNNIK (1789h) discusses the importance of Josephus for the study of the history of religion and his role as an apologist for Judaism. On the basis of Josephus' mention of mysteries in *Antiquities* 19. 104 and *Apion* 2. 188–189 and 266–267, he concludes that Josephus regarded the mysteries as being the highest form of religion in the eyes of his readers. In this connection, we may recall Philo's statement (*De Virtutibus* 178) that Moses initiated the Israelites into the mysteries, and his distinction between the lesser mysteries (*De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* 62 and *De Abrahamo* 122) and the greater mysteries (*Legum Allegoria* 3. 100, *De Cherubim* 49, and *De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini* 62) of Judaism.

### 19.1: G-d

- (1790) EDUARD NORDEN: *Agnostos Theos. Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede.* Leipzig 1913; 5th ed., Stuttgart 1971.
- (1791) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Abraham's Knowledge of the Existence of G-d. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 44, 1951, pp. 137–139.
- (1792) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Josephus. In: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 99, 1968, pp. 143–156.
- (1793) PETER DALBERT: *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluß von Philo und Josephus.* Hamburg 1954.
- (1794) SAMUEL S. COHON: The Unity of G-d: A Study in Hellenistic and Rabbinic Theology. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 26, 1955, pp. 425–479.
- (1795) ELPIDIUS PAX: ΕΠΙΦΑΝΕΙΑ. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie. München 1955.
- (1796) ANNIE JAUBERT: La notion d'Alliance dans le Judaïsme aux abords de l'ère chrétienne. *Patristica Sorbonensia*, 6. Paris 1963. Pp. 339–349: Flavius Josèphe.
- (1797) J. B. FISCHER: The Term ΔΕΣΠΟΤΗΣ in Josephus. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49, 1958–59, pp. 132–138.
- (1797a) GERHARD DELLING: Die Altarinschrift einer Gottesfürchtigen in Pergamon. In: *Novum Testamentum* 7, 1964, pp. 73–80.
- (1798) JOSEPH A. FITZMYER: The Semitic Background of the New Testament Kyrios-Title. In his: *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 25). Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 115–142.
- (1799) HANS-FRIEDRICH WEISS: *Untersuchungen zur Kosmologie des hellenistischen und palästinischen Judentums* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, vol. 97). Berlin 1966.
- (1800) DAVID L. TIEDE: *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker.* Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1970. Publ. (Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series, no. 1): Missoula, Montana 1972.
- (1801) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY: La mort d'Éléazar fils de Jaire et les Courants apotégétiques dans le *De Bello Judaico* de Flavius Josèphe. In: *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer.* Paris 1971. Pp. 461–490.
- (1802) DONNA R. RUNNALLS: *Hebrew and Greek Sources in the Speeches of Josephus' Jewish War.* Diss., University of Toronto 1971.
- (1803) HELGO LINDNER: *Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Judaicum.* Leiden 1972.
- (1803a) HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE: *The Presentation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus.* Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1975.

- Publ. as: The Interpretation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Missoula, Montana 1976.
- (1803b) WILFRED L. KNOX: Pharisaism and Hellenism. In: HERBERT M. J. LOEWE, ed., *The Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures*. London 1937; rpt. New York 1969. Pp. 59–111.
- (1803c) BERTIL GÄRTNER: *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*. Trans. by CAROLYN H. KING (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, 21). Diss. Uppsala. Uppsala 1955.
- (1803d) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39, 1977, pp. 581–583.
- (1803e) MORTON SMITH: *The Image of G-d: Notes on the Hellenization of Judaism, with especial Reference to Goodenough's Work on Jewish Symbols*. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40, 1957–58, pp. 473–512.
- (1803f) JOHANNES BIHLER: *Die Stephanusgeschichte, im Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte* (Münchener theologische Studien, 1: Historische Abteilung, 16. Bd.). München 1963.
- (1803g) FERDINAND HAHN: *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*. (Based on his diss., Heidelberg: Anfänge christologischer Traditionen). Göttingen 1963. Trans. into English by HAROLD KNIGHT and GEORGE OGG: *The Titles of Jesus in Christology; Their History in Early Christianity*. London 1969.
- (1803h) J. REUMANN: *Heilsgeschichte in Luke: Some Remarks on Its Background and Comparison with Paul*. In: *Studia Evangelica* 4.1 (ed. F. L. CROSS), Berlin 1968, pp. 86–115.
- (1803i) O. DREYER: *Untersuchungen zum Begriff des G-ttgeziemenden in der Antike*. Hildesheim 1970.
- (1803j) MARCEL SIMON: *Jupiter-Yahvé. Sur un essai de théologie pagano-juive*. In: *Numen* 23, 1976, pp. 40–66.
- (1803k) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: *Het godsprekkaat 'Het begin en het einde' bij Flavius Josephus en in de Openbaring van Johannes* (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks, deel 39, no. 1). Amsterdam 1976.
- (1803l) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY: *Le commentaire de l'écriture chez Philon d'Alexandrie. Son caractère et sa portée. Observations philologiques*. Leiden 1977.
- (1803m) YEHOASHUA AMIR: *Die Begegnung des biblischen und des philosophischen Monotheismus als Grundthema des jüdischen Hellenismus*. In: *Evangelische Theologie* 38, 1978, pp. 2–19.
- (1803ma) A.-L. DESCAMPS: *Pour une histoire du titre 'Fils de Dieu': Les antécédents par rapport à Marc*. In: M. SABBE, ed., *L'Évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 34; Journées bibliques de Louvain, 22 [1971]). Gembloux, Belgium 1974. Pp. 529–571.
- (1803mb) GOHEI HATA: *The Jewish War of Josephus: A Semantic and Historiographic Study*. Diss., Ph. D., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1975.
- (1803mc) MICHAEL LATKE: *Zur jüdischen Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Begriffs der Königsherrschaft G-tes*. In: *Festschrift Anton Vögtle*. Stuttgart 1975. Pp. 9–25.
- (1803md) LARS HARTMANN: *The Functions of Some So-Called Apocalyptic Timetables*. In: *New Testament Studies* 22, 1976, pp. 1–14.
- (1803me) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: *Flavius Josephus and the Mysteries*. In: MAARTEN J. VERMASEREN, ed., *Studies in Hellenistic Religions (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'empire romain, 78)*. Leiden 1979. Pp. 244–279.

NORDEN (1790) cites cogent evidence to substantiate his thesis that Josephus' description of G-d is influenced by Stoic coloring.

SANDMEL (1791) notes that Josephus is like the rabbis in having Abraham prove the existence of G-d through a process of reasoning. SANDMEL does not, however, discuss the basic difference between Josephus' (Ant. 1. 156) and the rabbis' proofs, namely that Josephus argues from consistency in the aberrations in the movements of the heavenly bodies, as I (1792) remark. The proof is in the form promulgated by the Greek philosophical schools, notably the Stoics. Indeed, the section immediately after the one containing Abraham's proof refers to the opposition of the Chaldaeans to his view; and we may note that in Philo (De Migratione Abrahami 179) the Chaldaeans are prototypes of the Stoics.

DALBERT (1793) notes the agreement of Josephus with the fragments of Hellenistic Jewish writers, such as Demetrius and Eupolemus, and the 'Sibylline Oracles' in the concept of the infinity of G-d's power and in the view of G-d as a δημιουργός. He notes that Josephus never speaks of G-d's face or eyes, that he speaks of the angels only in historical reports and not in connection with the present, and that sacrifices, unlike their role in the 'Letter of Aristeeas' and in Philo, have the purpose of achieving G-d's presence.

COHEN (1794), pp. 436–438, briefly summarizes Josephus' defense of the unity of G-d and his attack on idolatry.

PAX (1795), pp. 151–152, simply collects, without evaluation, the occurrences of the word ἐπιφάνεια in the 'Letter of Aristeeas' and in Josephus.

JAUBERT (1796), in her study of Jewish covenant theology from the Macedonian period to the destruction of the Second Temple, stresses, pp. 339–349, the Hellenization in Josephus' description of G-d, Who tends to be depersonalized and to resemble the anonymus Providence or fate of the Greeks. Josephus, she notes, is remarkable for the total absence of the vocabulary of the alliance.

FISCHER (1797) concludes that Josephus' avoidance of the term Κύριος in referring to G-d is due to the fact that it was the equivalent of the Tetragrammaton, which was too holy to mention, as the rabbis stressed; his use of δεσπότης may have been influenced by the Hebrew original before him. We may reply that if this were so, Josephus should have been more consistent; thus, in Antiquities 20. 90, Izates in his prayer addresses ὦ δέσποτα κύριε.

DELLING (1797a) notes that Κύριος refers to G-d in Josephus only in Antiquities 20. 90; we may add that Κύριος in Antiquities 13. 68 also refers to G-d.

FITZMYER (1798) pp. 121–122, also remarks that Josephus normally has δεσπότης where the Hebrew has the Tetragrammaton, but he recognizes that Josephus twice renders it with Κύριος (Ant. 13. 68 and 20. 90). He suggests that Josephus' usage may reflect an incipient practice among Greek-speaking Jews of Palestine. We may comment that if, indeed, this were so, we would expect it to be reflected in Aquila's translation of the Bible in the early second century and in the Aramaic Targumim of the Bible, where they often use Greek words. In both cases, however, we find the frequent use of the word Κύριος. Perhaps, we may suggest, Josephus avoided the word Κύριος because of its theological significance to Christians, with whose existence he was more concerned than were the rabbis at this time.

WEISS (1799), p. 50, notes that while Josephus (Ant. 1. 55, 1. 272, 7. 380) does employ the idea of a demiurge, we cannot draw any real conclusions as to Josephus' theory of his function. The fact, however, we may comment, that he uses the word *δημιουργός*, which was so prominent in Plato, the most popular philosopher during the Hellenistic period, would indicate that the word had the connotations that it has particularly in the "Timaeus" (40c).

TIEDE (1800), pp. 229–230, notes that Josephus frequently refrains from citing the Bible directly in order to avoid using the Divine name but that he is aware, as for example in his version of the trial by ordeal in Numbers 5. 11–31, of the tradition according to which the name had great, perhaps magical, potency.

NIKIPROWETZKY (1801) comments on the imperial mystique seen in Eleazar ben Jair's view (War 7. 359ff.) and Josephus' view (War 5. 378) that in fighting against the Romans the Jews were warring against G-d.

RUNNALLS (1802) analyzes four themes, among them G-d, common to several speeches in Josephus' "War".

LINDNER (1803) stresses that Josephus' contribution in his reworking of his sources, the chief of which, he believes, were the commentaries of Vespasian and Titus, was in emphasizing that G-d was on the side of Rome. We may remark that such a view might well have been embodied in the Commentaries themselves of Vespasian and Titus; and in any case there is good precedent in the Biblical prophets, such as Amos, for the view that G-d uses alien nations to fulfill his will.

ATTRIDGE (1803a) shows that the whole complex of designations for divine activity conveys a theology with a different emphasis from that of the Biblical sources, with the notion of a covenant virtually eliminated and with the concepts of divine providence and of the retributive activity of G-d strongly stressed. The providence theme, he suggests, reflects the personal experience of the historian in the Jewish revolt. Josephus looks upon G-d's special relation with Israel, he adds, as a particular case of His activity in upholding the moral order.

KNOX (1803b), pp. 82–84, notes that Moses at the burning bush (Exodus 3.13; Ant. 2.275–276) asks G-d His name, and that according to Josephus it is not lawful (*θεμιτόν*) to speak about this. KNOX remarks that the word *θεμιτός* is a technical term in the mystery cults, and that Josephus thus takes the opportunity to impart to Judaism the flavor of a mystery cult.

GÄRTNER (1803c), pp. 129–133, denies that Josephus has a proof of G-d's existence in Antiquities 1.154ff., but I (1792) have indicated otherwise. He concludes that as a theologian Josephus consciously kept his mind open to the Greek spirit. But, as I (1803d) have indicated in my review of ATTRIDGE, there is little theology in Josephus. Again, in commenting, pp. 215–217, on Antiquities 8. 111–115, GÄRTNER says that since the incentive for the sacrificial service does not lie in G-d's need of anything, the incentive must lie in men's desire to praise and thank.

SMITH (1803e), p. 500, commenting on Mnaseas' story (Apion 2. 112–114) of Zabidus, who promised to deliver Apollo into the hands of the Jews if they all



departed, says that this story reflects what it was thought the Jews would expect to see if an epiphany took place, namely an identification of G-d with the eyes of G-d. We may, however, ask why, if this were so, Zabidus put three rows of lamps in the apparatus which he put over his person. The Menorah, we may add, had seven branches, symbolizing perhaps the seven planets.

BIHLER (1803f), p. 138, cites *Antiquities* 8. 114 and 131, where Josephus terms the Temple the dwelling-place of G-d. At the same time, in deference to the Hellenistically educated rulers, Josephus has a certain inclination to recognize reinterpretations of cultic ideas; hence he can refer to virtue as the service of G-d (*War* 2. 192) and the cosmos as the house of G-d (*Ant.* 8. 107).

HAHN (1803g), p. 294, notes that Josephus is inconsistent in his view of men of G-d. On the one hand, he cites the sharp distinction between mortality and the divine, but on the other hand he uses *θεῖος* as an attribute of Moses and of the prophets (*Ant.* 6. 76, 8. 34); hence we may conclude that a far-reaching Hellenization had set in. We may, however, note that to speak of Moses as *θεῖος* merely reflects the Bible, which refers to him as a man of G-d (*Deut.* 33. 1).

REUMANN (1803h), pp. 105-108, discusses the concept of Divine providence in Josephus. He contends that Josephus has a pattern of divine administration in history akin to that in certain Hellenistic historians, notably Polybius, but applied to the G-d of Israel. He also comments, p. 109, on the references to G-d as *δεσπότης* in Josephus.

DREIER (1803i), pp. 70-72, commenting on *Antiquities* 1. 15 and *Apion* 2. 168, discusses Josephus' conception of what is seemly for G-d in Judaism.

SIMON (1803j), commenting on *Antiquities* 12. 22, 253, and 320, remarks that the silence which Josephus observes as to the name of the divinity enthroned in Jerusalem is significant. Josephus' point of view is that Zeus is G-d, as we may see in the citation which he makes of the 'Letter of Aristeeas' and in the fashion in which he presents the measures taken by Antiochus. He says that those who identified Jupiter and G-d perhaps drew the argument of a providential coincidence of the destruction of the temple of the Capitol in 69 and that of Jerusalem. The suggestion, however, seems far-fetched, and in any case is unmentioned by any writer, pagan or Jewish.

I have not seen VAN UNNIK (1803k), who discusses the history of doctrines of G-d in Josephus.

NIKIPROWETZKY (1803l), pp. 46-47, concludes, particularly on the basis of *War* 2. 163-164, that G-d in Josephus is Providence (*εἰμαρμένη*).

AMIR (1803m) discusses Josephus' presentation of monotheism, especially in his account of Abraham and Moses, in comparison with that of other Hellenistic-Jewish writers, notably Philo, and the reaction of non-Jewish philosophers, particularly Posidonius, to such views in the Hellenistic period. Commenting on *Apion* 2. 168, he concludes that Josephus' portrayal of Moses in his comprehension of G-d is in line with the great Hellenistic philosophers, but that Moses had more courage than they had. He says that the encounter with Greek thought had far less impact on Judaism than it did on Christianity.

DESCAMPS (1803ma) notes that the term 'son of G-d' appears nowhere in Josephus, since G-d does not engender: he creates. Josephus, he observes, rejects the idea of a *κοινωνία* between G-d and mortals. He says that to call Moses and the prophets *θεῖοι* reflects a sensible Hellenization of the Biblical concept of the man of G-d.

HATA (1803mb) concludes that there were three sources for Josephus' view that G-d works not only through the Jews but also through others, namely his Pharisaic training, his Roman experience, and his presence when the soldiers of Vespasian proclaimed him emperor.

LATKE (1803mc) concludes that Josephus contributes nothing to the problem of tracing the history of the 'kingship of G-d'. Josephus, he notes, was opposed to this concept and hence suppressed it. Jesus, too, was sharply opposed to the political rule of G-d. We may comment that Josephus himself says (Ant. 18. 23) that the Fourth Philosophy agrees with the Pharisees in all respects except that they have an almost unconquerable passion for liberty, "since they are convinced that G-d alone is their leader and master." The implication is that the Pharisees, with whom Josephus identified himself, did not stress the kingship of G-d.

HARTMANN (1803md) notes that Josephus (Ant. 10. 267) had nothing against regarding G-d as active in history, though not in terms of extraordinary divine interventions.

VAN UNNIK (1803me) comments on Josephus' statement that the Greek philosophers, who ultimately, according to him, depend upon Moses, kept the truth about G-d from the masses, while Moses implanted his belief about G-d in his contemporaries and in future generations.

## 19.2: The Decalogue

(1803n) WILFRED L. KNOX: Pharisaism and Hellenism. In: HERBERT M. J. LOEWE, ed., *The Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures*. London 1937; rpt. New York 1969. Pp. 59–111.

(1803o) KLAUS BERGER: *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu in der synoptischen Tradition und ihr Hintergrund im Alten Testament und im Spätjudentum*. Diss., München 1966.

(1803p) GEZA VERMES: The Decalogue and the Minim. In: MATTHEW BLACK and GEORG FOHRER, edd., *In memoriam Paul Kahle*. Berlin 1968. Pp. 232–240.

(1803q) F. E. VOKES: The Ten Commandments in the New Testament and in First Century Judaism. In: *Studia Evangelica* 5.2 (ed. F. L. CROSS; Berlin 1968) (= *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, vol. 103), pp. 146–154.

(1803r) LUIZ DíEZ MERINO: El Decálogo en el Targum Palestinense. Origen, Estilo y Motivaciones. In: *Estudios Bíblicos* 34, 1975, pp. 23–48.

KNOX (1803n), pp. 85–86, commenting on *Antiquities* 3. 90, where Josephus says that it is not lawful for him to give the words of the Decalogue explicitly, since they are the words of G-d Himself, says that this suggests a local custom of treating the words of the Decalogue as a mystery. We may suggest that Josephus is here supplementing the list of Biblical passages given in

the Talmud (Megillah 25a–b) which are read in the synagogue but are not translated.

BERGER (1803o), pp. 104–105, notes that the Decalogue is cited as such in late Jewish literature only in Philo, Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', and Josephus.

VERMES (1803p), pp. 233 and 239, asserts that Josephus insinuates that the Decalogue shares the sanctity of the ineffable Tetragrammaton.

VOKES (1803q), pp. 149–150, commenting on Antiquities 3. 90, notes that when Josephus says that it is not lawful for him to reveal to outsiders the words of the Decalogue, he uses the same word (θεμντόν) as was employed in the mysteries about not revealing the sacred name of G-d (Ant. 2. 275–276).

DIÉZ MERINO (1803r), p. 33, after comparing the Masoretic text of the two versions of the Decalogue (Exodus 20. 1–17, Deuteronomy 5. 6–21) with the versions in the Nash papyrus, Qumran fragments, the Septuagint, Philo, the New Testament, Josephus (Ant. 3. 91–92), and the Targumim, including the newly found Targum Neofiti, concludes that all of these reveal a tradition which is consistent in essential treatment, if not in form. It is only in style that there is an evolution.

### 19.3: Demons

(1803s) H. W. M. DE JONG: *Demonische Ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*. Leiden 1959.

(1803t) LOREN R. FISHER: *Can This Be the Son of David?* In: FREDERICK THOMAS TROTTER, ed., *Jesus and the Historian*. Written in Honor of Ernest Cadman Colwell. Philadelphia 1968. Pp. 82–97.

DE JONG (1803s), pp. 107–115, commenting on Antiquities 8. 46–49, as well as on War 4. 480, 6. 166–168, 6. 211, 6. 300–305, and 7. 180–185, discusses demonic medicine in Josephus in relation to ancient Babylonia, the Bible, and the New Testament.

FISHER (1803t), p. 85, discusses King Solomon as an exorcist in relation to 'Sefer ha-Razim' (edited by MORDECAI MARGALIOTH, Jerusalem 1966), which similarly refers to Solomon as a magician, and in relation to Jesus' healings and exorcisms as recounted in the New Testament.

### 19.4: Magic

(1803u) MORTON SMITH: *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*. Cambridge, Mass. 1973.

SMITH (1803u), p. 220, argues that Jews during the Hellenistic-Roman period used the same magical practices that non-Jews employed, and that, indeed, to judge from Josephus (Ant. 8. 46), they were famous as magicians. He cites as parallels for Jesus' career as a magician the reports (War 2. 258ff., Ant. 20. 97, 188) that in Palestine during this period there was a plethora of messianic

magicians who likewise raised men's hopes that the kingdom would soon arrive and who were likewise put to death by the Romans.

### 19.5: Dreams

(1803v) GERHARD DAUTZENBERG: Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der διακρίσις πνευμάτων (1 Kor 12, 10). In: *Biblische Zeitschrift* 15, 1971, pp. 93–104.

(1803w) K. FERRARI D'OCCHIEPPO: *Der Stern der Weisen. Geschichte oder Legende*. Wien 1969; 2nd ed. 1977.

DAUTZENBERG (1803v) declares that the references in Josephus lead to the conclusion that the interpretation of oracles, signs, and dreams constitute a definite element in the life of Palestinian Judaism of the New Testament period.

FERRARI D'OCCHIEPPO (1803w), pp. 62 ff., comments on John Hyrcanus' dream (Ant. 13. 321–322) that Alexander Jannaeus would succeed him.

### 19.6: The Soul

(1804) RUDOLF MEYER: *Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie: rabbinische Vorstellungen von Werden des Menschen* (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, 4. Folge, hft. 22). Stuttgart 1937.

(1805) HANS BIETENHARD: *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*. Tübingen 1951.

(1806) CORD H. LINDJER: *Het Begrip Sarx bij Paulus*. Diss., Assen 1952.

(1807) ROBERT H. CHARLES: *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, in Judaism, and in Christianity; or, Hebrew, Jewish, and Christian Eschatology from pre-prophetic times till the close of the New Testament Canon*. London 1899. Rpt., with an introduction by GEORGE W. BUCHANAN, as: *Eschatology: The Doctrine of a Future Life in Israel, Judaism, and Christianity; a critical history*. New York 1963.

(1808) ALEXANDER SAND: *Der Begriff 'Fleisch' in den Paulinischen Hauptbriefen*. Diss., München. Publ.: Regensburg 1967.

(1808a) AIMO T. NIKOLAINEN: *Der Auferstehungsglauben in der Bibel und ihrer Umwelt*, 1. Helsinki 1944.

(1808b) HANS C. C. CAVALLIN: *Life after Death. Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Cor. 15. 1. An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*. Diss., Uppsala. Publ.: Lund 1974. [See *infra*, p. 937.]

MEYER (1804) notes that Josephus effects a compromise between the Hellenistic pessimistic outlook on the body and the earthly existence of the soul, on the one hand, and the genuine Jewish approach, which asserted that G-d was the L-rd of history and was alone, so that the soul is freed of its previous existence. We may comment, however, that Judaism during this period was not so monolithic as MEYER would have it, and that even the rabbis have a wide range of views concerning the soul, including points of view, such as the pre-existence of the soul, also found in Hellenistic thought.

BIETENHARD (1805), commenting on War 3. 372–374, notes that in his speech to his men at Jotapata, Josephus combines the Greek doctrine of immor-

tality with the Jewish hope for the resurrection of the dead as found in the Talmud.

I have not seen LINDJER (1806), who, pp. 88–93, compares Philo and Josephus in their concept of σάρξ (“flesh”).

CHARLES (1807), pp. 354–355, says that Josephus' account (Ant. 18. 14) of the Pharisaic belief regarding the soul may be regarded as fairly trustworthy, but that War 3. 372–374, where he describes the soul as a portion of Divinity (θεοῦ μοῖρα) which has taken up its abode in a mortal body and which after death will be sent again into a pure body, is misleading to a high degree and is derived from Greek philosophy. We may comment that the latter passage, with its parallel in Against Apion 2. 218, which says that to those who observe the laws G-d has granted a renewed existence and, in the revolution of the ages, the gift of a better life, refers not to metempsychosis, which was not a tenet of Judaism of the Pharisees and indeed does not become widespread in Judaism until the twelfth century, but to the belief in resurrection, which was a central doctrine of the Pharisees. Thus in Antiquities 18. 14, in speaking of the good soul's passage to a new life, Josephus employs the verb ἀναβιώω, which corresponds to the noun ἀναβίωσις found in II Maccabees 7. 9, where the reference to resurrection is clear. The statement (War 2. 163) that the Pharisees believe that after death the soul of the good man alone passes into another body does seem a reference to metempsychosis, however.

SAND (1808), pp. 284–285, noting that Josephus equates σάρξ and σῶμα, says that Josephus, in his use of σάρξ, is influenced by Platonic dualism.

NIKOLAINEN (1808a), pp. 169–178, comments on the belief of Philo and of Josephus in a new life for the immortal soul.

CAVALLIN (1808b), pp. 141–147, concludes that Josephus very cautiously but consistently alludes to some type of resurrection, but that he inclines toward a Hellenized interpretation of the Jewish belief in an afterlife.

### 19.7: Fate and Free Will

- (1809) RUDOLF MEYER: Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie: rabbinische Vorstellungen von Werden des Menschen (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament, 4. Folge, hft. 22). Stuttgart 1937.
- (1810) DAVID FLUSSER: The Pharisees and the Stoics according to Josephus (in Hebrew). In: Iyyun 14, 1963, pp. 318–329.
- (1811) GEORGE F. MOORE: Fate and Free Will in the Jewish Philosophies according to Josephus. In: Harvard Theological Review 22, 1929, pp. 371–389. Trans. into German by JAKOB MITTELMANN in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed., Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84). Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 167–189.
- (1812) SIDNEY G. SOWERS: On the Reinterpretation of Biblical History in Hellenistic Judaism. In: Oikonomia: Festschrift Oscar Cullmann. Hamburg 1967. Pp. 18–25.
- (1813) LUDWIG WÄCHTER: Die unterschiedliche Haltung der Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener zur Heimarmene nach dem Bericht des Josephus. In: Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte 21, 1969, pp. 97–114.
- (1814) PAOLO SACCHI: Appunti per una storia della crisi della legge nel giudaismo del tempio di Gesù. Quaderni della rivista Bibbia e Oriente 12, 1970, pp. 199–211.

- (1815) GERHARD MAIER: Mensch und freier Wille: Nach den jüdischen Religionsparteien zwischen Ben Sira und Paulus. Diss., Tübingen 1969/70. Publ.: Tübingen 1971.
- (1816) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (1817) HELGO LINDNER: Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus in Bellum Judaicum. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, vol. 12. Diss., Tübingen 1971. Publ.: Leiden 1972.
- (1818) GUSTAV STÄHLIN: Das Schicksal im Neuen Testament und bei Josephus. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 319–343.
- (1818a) WILLY THEILER: Tacitus und die antike Schicksalslehre. In: Phyllobolia für Peter von der Mühl. Basel 1946. Pp. 35–90.
- (1818b) ELPIDIUS PAX: 'Ich gebe hin meinen Leib und mein Glück'. Eine Lesart zu 2 Makk 7, 37. In: Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus 16, 1965–66, pp. 357–368.
- (1818c) OTTO MICHEL: Studien zu Josephus. Apokalyptische Heilsansagen im Bericht des Josephus (BJ 6, 290f., 293–295); ihre Umdeutung bei Josephus. In: Festschrift Matthew Black. Edinburgh 1969. Pp. 240–244.
- (1818d) GOHEI HATA: *The Jewish War of Josephus: A Semantic and Historiographic Study*. Diss., Ph. D., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1975.
- (1818e) DAVID FLUSSER: *The Jewish Religion in the Second Temple Period*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (World History of the Jewish People, 1.8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 3–40, 322–324.

MEYER (1809) asserts that Josephus' presentation of the doctrine of fate is un-Jewish and directed to his Hellenistic readers.

Inasmuch as Josephus (Life 12) compares the Pharisees with the Stoics, FLUSSER (1810), examining the Stoic terminology in Josephus' description of the Pharisees, concludes that Josephus did not understand Stoic philosophy. But, we may comment, Josephus does not say that the Pharisees are the same as the Stoics in all respects; he says that the sect is *παραπλήσιος*, that is "nearly resembling," "approximately equal" to the Stoics. We may add that Josephus was probably influenced by his desire, in an effort to appeal to his Greek readers, to find parallels in Jewish thought for the major Greek schools – Stoics (Pharisees), Epicureans (Sadducees, by implication), and Pythagoreans (Essenes) (Ant. 15. 371). FLUSSER is not convincing when he argues that Josephus has preserved a trustworthy picture of the theological attitudes of Judaism of his time.

FLUSSER is not acquainted with the article by MOORE (1811), which notes that Josephus' confusion may have arisen from the fact that for *εἰμαρμένη* there was no equivalent word in Hebrew and no corresponding conception, since Jewish determinism was theological, not philosophical. We may comment that Josephus seems to use *εἰμαρμένη* in the sense of divine determinism or providence, rather than Fate in the Stoic sense. We may also here call attention to the fact that Antiquities 18. 13, which declares that everything is brought about by *εἰμαρμένη* (though the Pharisees "do not deprive the human will of the pursuit of what is in man's power"), contradicts Antiquities 13. 172, which states that certain events, but not all, are the work of fate.

SOWERS (1812) notes that Josephus' use of *πρόνοια* (Providence) as guiding Biblical history shows kinship with *πρόνοια* in Stoic historiography and in the 'Wisdom of Solomon'. We may add that the fact that Josephus compares the Pharisees with the Stoics may have furthered his tendency to look to Stoic inspiration for his philosophy of history.

WÄCHTER (1813) says that the reason why Josephus, when he compared the three major Jewish sects, chose to focus on their attitude toward *εἰμασμένη* was that he was writing for a Hellenistic audience, who contrasted the Stoics, Epicureans, and Pythagoreans primarily on this issue. Whereas Josephus (Ant. 13. 173) stresses that the Sadducees do away with the concept of Fate, the rabbis and the New Testament, WÄCHTER correctly says, make no mention of this Sadducean view. If, we may comment, Josephus does not explicitly equate the Sadducees and the Epicureans, he may have sought to avoid such downright insults because the Sadducees were so strong among the priestly class to which Josephus belonged. We may add that Josephus (Ant. 13. 171) chooses to compare the three schools in the opinions that they held "concerning human affairs" (*περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων*) rather than concerning distinctly Jewish theological positions because his audience, being primarily non-Jewish, would hardly be interested in theological matters. The fact that he indicates (Ant. 20. 268) that he will discuss such matters as beliefs "concerning G-d and His essence, as well as concerning the laws" in a separate work (presumably intended for a primarily Jewish audience) is further evidence that he did not regard the 'Antiquities' as the proper place for such discussions.

SACCHI (1814) summarizes the attitude toward fate of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes.

MAIER (1815), pp. 1–23, follows MOORE (1811) in asserting that the chief point of difference among the three major sects was the attitude toward fate; but, we may comment, the absence of such a discussion from the Talmud indicates that the attitude toward the Oral Law was much more central, as, indeed, we may infer from the New Testament (Matthew 15. 1–11, Mark 7. 1–23). He says that the idea of *εἰμασμένη* came not from a foreign source, Nicolaus of Damascus, as MOORE would have it, nor from a Jewish source, as HÖLSCHER (1816) posits, but from Josephus himself; but, we may comment, the fact that there is no equivalent for *εἰμασμένη* in Hebrew argues against such a theory. MAIER proceeds to correct Josephus' account on the basis of contemporary sources, especially the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls, noting, in particular, that the Psalms of Solomon contain a view of fate and free will closely resembling that ascribed to the Pharisees by Josephus.

LINDNER (1817) argues too dogmatically that Josephus equated G-d with Fortune (*Τύχη*) as guiding human history. In this LINDNER depends heavily on War 5. 367; but this passage, we must comment, occurs in Josephus' own speech urging the Jews to surrender, and analogy with other speeches in Josephus shows his predilection for Hellenizing such concepts for the sake of his Greek readers. LINDNER concludes, after a thorough examination of the speeches by Agrippa II (War 2. 345–401), by Josephus (War 5. 363–419), and by Eleazar ben Jair (War 7. 323–336, 341–388), that these speeches are vehicles

to express Josephus' own views and are not simply propaganda. He says that though Josephus is a Flavian historian he is Jewish and expounds a religious view of history; but we must comment that though Josephus asserts such a view in the prooemium to his 'Antiquities' (1. 14–15), in practice, as we have already noted, he reworks Biblical episodes to diminish the role of G-d and of miracles.

STÄHLIN (1818) emphasizes the contrast between Josephus' generally ambivalent terminology and idea of fate and the clear position in the New Testament. Josephus, he stresses, was influenced by Hellenistic ideas.

THEILER (1818a), pp. 38–40, presents a brief survey of τύχη and εἰμαρμένη in Josephus in relation to Stoic and Epicurean views of fate (War 2. 162ff., Ant. 10. 277ff., 13. 172–173, 15. 371). He notes the Pythagorean strokes in War 2. 119ff., 123, and 137ff.

PAX (1818b), pp. 362–364, remarks that it is τύχη, which is a discharge of the divine will, as well as a human protection, that gives Josephus the moral authority to go over to the side of the Romans (War 3. 340ff.). Τύχη should also be regarded as an element of style in line with ancient prodigy literature. He comments that the variants in II Maccabees 7. 37 and the usage in Josephus show that the variety of the words in the Septuagint and the complete absence of the word τύχη in the New Testament cannot be ascribed to apologetic grounds exclusively.

MICHEL (1818c) remarks that Titus' reflection (War 3. 396) on the power of τύχη is a Hellenistic interpretation of political history which differentiates it from the Pharisaic point of view.

HATA (1818d) compares Josephus' concept of τύχη with that of Polybius and concludes that Josephus uses the term not necessarily because he was influenced by Polybius but because he knew that the concepts which the word connotes would help to convey his ideas effectively to his audience.

FLUSSER (1818e) notes that the Pharisaic point of view on providence and free will has not been preserved in the Talmudic literature in as detailed a form as it is in Josephus, whose information may be accepted, since it offers a complete outlook. We may comment that the reason why the Talmudic sages did not record their views of providence and free will is because the Talmud is primarily a book of law and secondarily a work of Haggadic exegesis and only very incidentally a work of theology. For that matter, Josephus did not write a book of theology, but rather a work of history, though he shows more interest in sheer theology than do the rabbis. To say that Josephus' account of the views of the Pharisees is complete is surely an exaggeration.

## 19.8: Suffering

(1818f) C. D. PEDDINGHAUS: Die Entstehung der Leidensgeschichte. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und historische Untersuchung des Werdens und Wachsens der erzählenden Passionstradition bis zum Entwurf des Marcus. Diss., Heidelberg 1965.

PEDDINGHAUS (1818f), pp. 43–47, deals with the Biblical state of suffering and its interpretation in Philo and in Josephus.



## 19.9: Prayer

- (1819) S. (= ISTVÁN) HAHN: Josephus on prayer in c. Ap. II. 197. In: OTTO KOMLOS, ed., *Études orientales à la mémoire de Paul Hirschler*. Budapest 1950. Pp. 111–115.
- (1820) HENRY A. FISCHER: Studies in Cynicism and the Ancient Near East: The Transformation of a *Chria*. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., *Studies in the History of Religions, 14: Religions in Antiquity (Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough)*. Leiden 1968. Pp. 372–411.
- (1821) SVERRE AALEN: Die Begriffe 'Licht' und 'Finsternis' im Alten Testament, im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske videnskaps akademii i Oslo. II. Hist.-filos. Klasse 1951, no. 1). Oslo 1951.
- (1822) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 4, *Jewish Antiquities, Books I–IV* (Loeb Classical Library). London 1930.
- (1823) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews'. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4, 1965, pp. 163–188. Trans. into German by JAKOB MITTELMANN in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed., *Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84)*. Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 367–400.
- (1824) WERNER GRIMM: Der Dank für die empfangene Offenbarung bei Jesus und Josephus: Parallelen zu Mt 11, 25–27. In: *Das Institutum Judaicum der Univ. Tübingen* 1971–72, Tübingen 1972, pp. 69–78; also in: *Biblische Zeitschrift* 17, 1973, pp. 249–256.
- (1825) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: Eine merkwürdige liturgische Aussage bei Josephus: Jos Ant 8, 111–113. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 362–369.
- (1825a) WERNER BAIER: Liturgie und Kult in der frühjüdischen und frühchristlichen Umwelt (etwa 200 v. – 200 n. Chr.). In: *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 13, 1971, pp. 282–295.

HAHN (1819) says that the fundamental difference between Josephus' view of prayer and Greek and Jewish parallels is that Josephus' concept is man-centered whereas the others are G-d-centered. He claims that the parallel between Against Apion 2. 197, with its statement that we should beseech G-d not to give us blessings but to have the capacity to receive them, is strikingly parallel to Horace, Odes 1. 31, with its prayer to Apollo not for wealth but for the capacity to enjoy one's possessions, and asserts that both reflect a Cynic diatribe. The widespread use of Cynic anecdotes (*chriai*) and motifs in rabbinic literature shows their popularity among Jews, as FISCHER (1820) has shown; but, we may note, while the general motif is similar, the details in Horace and in Josephus are very different.

AALEN (1821), pp. 116–117, comments on the close connection between the Shema prayer and the daily sacrifice (Ant. 4. 212). THACKERAY (1822), p. 577, in his note on this passage, comments that Jews are required to pray three times daily but fails to realize that the prescription to pray twice daily, at dawn and when going to sleep, refers to the Shema.

SCHALIT (1823), pp. 172–176, comparing the prayer of Izates (Ant. 20. 90) with that of Moses (Ant. 4. 40–50), notes that the latter is a deliberately elaborate piece of religious rhetoric which is Josephus' work, with a minimum of help from his assistants, since it has clearly Semitic elements (though, we may comment,

there is no reason to presuppose that Josephus' assistants necessarily had a poor Semitic background simply because they knew Greek so well). As to the prayer of Mordochaeus (Mordecai, Ant. 11. 229–230), we may see Josephus' source in the Septuagint, though in a somewhat paraphrased form. In Izates' prayer Josephus employs direct speech exactly as in 11. 229–230, and Schalit consequently concludes that it is based on a *Vorlage*; he suggests that the whole prayer, moreover, has an Aramaic character. We may comment that the use of direct speech is merely a common rhetorical device without particular significance.

GRIMM (1824) notes that I Enoch 39. 9–11, The Dead Sea Psalms of Thanksgiving 7.26–27, and Josephus, War 3. 354, all display prayers of thanksgiving in response to a preceding divine revelation. Daniel 2. 19–23 provides the model for these prayers; but in Matthew 11. 25–27 Jesus polemicizes against Daniel's restriction of apocalyptic understanding to the wise and prudent, and his thanksgiving is a response to the fulfillment of a petition based on the promise in Isaiah 29. 14 and 44. 24–26. GRIMM also notes that Josephus' prayer at Jotapata is an indirect apology which pushes off upon G-d all responsibility of what happened there.

VAN UNNIK (1825) comments that Solomon's prayer of thanks to G-d (Ant. 8. 111–113) is dependent on popular thought of the time, probably transmitted through the Hellenistic synagogue, in view of Josephus' similarity in this to Philo's *De Plantatione* 130–131.

BAIER (1825a), pp. 286–288, has a brief critical bibliography of arbitrarily selected books dealing with Josephus' view of prayer.

### 19.10: The Synagogue

(1825b) MARTIN HENGEL: *Proseuche und Synagoge. Jüdische Gemeinde, G-teshaus und G-tesdienst in der Diaspora und in Palästina*. In: GERT JEREMIAS, et al., edd., *Festschrift Karl G. Kuhn*. Göttingen 1971. Pp. 157–184.

(1825c) KURT HRUBY: *Die Synagoge. Geschichtliche Entwicklung einer Institution*. Zürich 1971.

(1825d) GIDEON FOERSTER: *The Synagogues at Masada and Herodium* (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 11, 1973, pp. 224–228.

(1825e) SHMUEL SAFRAI: *The Synagogue and Its Worship*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (*The World History of the Jewish People*, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 65–98, 338–345.

HENGEL (1825b), pp. 168–177, deals with the terms for synagogue in Josephus, the New Testament, inscriptions, and rabbinic literature, with particular reference to War 2. 285ff. and 7. 43–46; *Antiquities* 14. 115, 14. 258. 14. 260, 16. 164, and 19. 299–311; *Life* 277ff. and 290ff.; and *Apion* 1. 189 and 2. 10.

HRUBY (1825c) deals with the terms for synagogue in Josephus: *Antiquities* 16. 164 (p. 26); War 2. 123 (p. 36); *Antiquities* 14. 258 (pp. 37, 68); *Antiquities* 14. 215 (p. 58); War 6. 425 (p. 70); *Antiquities* 3. 248, War 7. 45 (p. 72); *Apion* 2. 10, 21, 39 (p. 84).

FOERSTER (1825d) notes that the literary sources, including Josephus (War 2. 285–290, Ant. 19. 300, Life 277), the New Testament, and the rabbinic corpus, attest to the existence of numerous synagogues in Israel at the time of the Second Temple. Further confirmation is found in the synagogues unearthed at Masada and at Herodium, both dating from the First War against the Romans.

SAFRAI (1825e) surveys the sources; the beginnings of the synagogue and its spread in the late Second Temple period; the names of the synagogues in Palestine and in the Diaspora; the character of the synagogue and its form of divine worship; assemblies on Sabbaths, Festivals, and weekdays; prayer, Torah-reading, and sermons; the conduct of the synagogue and its officials; the location and structure of the synagogue; and various usages of the synagogue.

### 19.11: Baptism

(1825f) S. LÉGASSE: Baptême juif des prosélytes et baptême chrétien. In: *Bulletin de Littérature Ecclésiastique* 77, 1976, pp. 3–40.

LÉGASSE (1825f) concludes that Christian baptism could not have been derived from its Jewish analogy, since there is remarkable silence about this practice in the New Testament, Philo, and Josephus. We may, however, comment that the fact that Josephus (Ant. 18. 117) uses the term baptism in connection with John the Baptist without explaining the term and the fact that he contrasts the purpose of baptism according to others (to gain pardon for sins) and according to John (as a consecration of the body, implying that the soul had already been cleansed by right behavior) shows that the institution of baptism was well established in Judaism before the time of John.

### 19.12: The Priests Generally

(1826) BEN-ZION LURIE: Priestly Cities in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44, 1973, pp. 1–18.

(1827) EHRHARD KAMLAH: Frömmigkeit und Tugend: Die Gesetzesapologie des Josephus in c. Ap 2, 145–295. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 220–232.

(1827a) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: Class-Status and Leadership in the World of the Palestinian Sages. In: *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 2, 1968, pp. 38–74.

(1827b) BARUCH SHARVIT: The Priest in the Judaean Desert Sect (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 22, 1976–77, pp. 313–320.

(1827c) DANIEL R. SCHWARTZ: The Priests in *Ep. Arist.* 310. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97, 1978, pp. 567–571.

LURIE (1826) examines the sources, notably Josephus, to determine in precisely which cities outside Jerusalem the priestly families had fixed residences during the period of the Second Temple.

KAMLAH (1827) notes how Josephus is dependent for his account of the activities of the priests and for other details on Hecataeus' account of the Jews (Against Apion 2. 193–194).

URBACH (1827a) comments that the genealogical purity of the priests which is mentioned by Josephus (Apion 1. 7 and War 6. 114) is confirmed by the Mishnah (Sanhedrin 4. 2).

SHARVIT (1827b), commenting on Josephus' statement (Ant. 20. 216–218) on the struggle between the priests and the Levites, remarks that it is difficult to ascertain from the writings of the Dead Sea Sect whether this struggle went on within the Sect.

SCHWARTZ (1827c) asks how the translators of the Torah into Greek could have certified their own work as pious and accurate. He answers that the priests who certified the work were not the translators. He cites the statement of Hecataeus (ap. Apion 1. 187–189) that a certain Hezekiah, a "chief priest," was prominent among the Jews who went to Egypt at the beginning of the settlement. He also notes Josephus' statement that the important high priestly house of Boethus was of Alexandrian origin.

### 19.13: The Description of the Temple

- (1828) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *By Light, Light*. New Haven 1935.
- (1829) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. Vol. 8. New York 1958.
- (1830) OSCAR HOLTZMANN, ed. and trans.: *Traktat Middot (Von den Massen des Tempels)*. Giessen 1913.
- (1831) JAN J. SIMONS: *Jerusalem in the Old Testament; Researches and Theories*. Leiden 1952.
- (1832) LOUIS-HUGUES VINCENT: *Le temple hérodien d'après la Mišnah*. In: *Revue Biblique* 61, 1954, pp. 5–35, 398–418.
- (1833) LOUIS-HUGUES VINCENT and M.-A. STÈVE: *Jérusalem de l'Ancient Testament, recherches d'archéologie et d'histoire*. Paris 1954–56. 2 vols. Vol. 1, pp. 193–221; vol. 2, pp. 373–610.
- (1834) ANDRÉ PARROT: *Le Temple de Jérusalem*. Neuchâtel 1954. Trans. into English by B. E. HOOKE: *The Temple of Jerusalem (Studies in Biblical Archaeology, no. 5)*. London 1957. Pp. 76–100. Trans. into German by ERNST JENNI et alii: *Der Tempel von Jerusalem. Golgotha und das Heilige Grab*. Zollikon-Zürich 1956.
- (1835) JEHOSSUA BRAND: *Some Observations on the Second Temple Edifice (in Hebrew)*. In: *Tarbiz* 29, 1959–60, pp. 210–217.
- (1836) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *Reply to the Article by Joshua Brand (in Hebrew)*. In: *Tarbiz* 29, 1959–60, pp. 218–221.
- (1837) ALICE MUEHSAM: *Coin and Temple: A Study of the Architectural Representation on Ancient Jewish Coins (Leeds Univ. Oriental Society, Near Eastern Researches, 1)*. Leiden 1966.
- (1838) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: ALICE MUEHSAM, *Coin and Temple*. In: *American Journal of Archaeology* 71, 1967, p. 417.
- (1839) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *The Façade of Herod's Temple, an Attempted Reconstruction*. In JACOB NEUSNER, ed., *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin*

- Ramsdell Goodenough (*Studies in the History of Religions*, 14). Leiden 1968. Pp. 327–335.
- (1840) SHMUEL SAFRAI and MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Temple. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 961–969.
- (1841) KURT GALLING: Durch die Himmel hindurchgeschritten (Heb. iv. 14). In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43, 1950–51, pp. 263–264.
- (1842) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. New York 1950.
- (1843) ETHELBERT STAUFFER: Das Tor des Nikanor. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 44, 1952–53, pp. 44–66.
- (1844) ROLAND BERGMEIER: Miszellen zu Flavius Josephus, *De Bello Judaico* 5, 208 und 236. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54, 1963, pp. 268–271.
- (1845) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: There Was No Synagogue in the Temple. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 53, 1962–63, pp. 168–169.
- (1846) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: The Suppositious Temple-Synagogue. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 54, 1963–64, pp. 115–131.
- (1847) JACOB LIVER: The Half-Shekel Offering in Biblical and Post-Biblical Literature. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 56, 1963, pp. 173–198.
- (1848) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Le 'voile' du Temple de Jérusalem, est-il devenu la 'Portière' du Temple d'Olympie? In: *Syria* 32, 1955, pp. 289–307.
- (1849) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Le 'voile du Temple' de Jérusalem en termes de métier. In: *Revue des Études grecques* 77, 1964, pp. 70–75.
- (1850) SHEMUEL YEIVIN: Was There a High Portal in the First Temple? In: *Vetus Testamentum* 14, 1964, pp. 331–343.
- (1851) URSULA FRÜCHTEL: *Die kosmologischen Vorstellungen bei Philo von Alexandrien: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Genesisexegese*. Leiden 1968.
- (1852) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: There Was No Court of Gentiles in the Temple Area. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 56, 1965–66, pp. 88–89.
- (1853) PAUL WINTER: Rejoinder. In: *Commentary* 39, March 1965, pp. 20–28.
- (1854) JOSEPH GUTMANN: A Note on the Temple Menorah. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 60, 1969, pp. 289–291.
- (1855) I. RENOV: View of Herod's Temple from Nicanor's Gate in a Mural Panel of the Dura-Europos Synagogue. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 20, 1970, pp. 67–74.
- (1856) RACHEL WISCHNITZER: *The Messianic Theme in the Paintings of the Dura Synagogue*. Chicago 1948.
- (1857) MICHEL DU BUIT: Au temple de Jérusalem avec Flavius Josèphe. In: *Rencontre Chrétienne et Juifs* 5.20, 1971, pp. 33–36.
- (1857a) JOHANN MAIER: *Vom Kultus zur Gnosis. Studien zur Vor- und Frühgeschichte der 'jüdischen Gnosis'. Bundeslade, Gottesthron und Märkabh (Kairos: religionswissenschaftliche Studien, 1)*. Salzburg 1964.
- (1857b) R. J. MCKELVEY: *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament*. (Oxford Theological Monographs, 3). Oxford 1969.
- (1857c) TH. A. BUSINK: *Der Tempel von Jerusalem, von Salomo bis Herodes; eine archäologisch-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus, I: Der Tempel Salomos*. Studia F. Scholten memoriae dicata. Leiden 1970.
- (1857d) JAN W. DOEVE: Le domaine du temple de Jérusalem. In: *Recherches bibliques* 9 (ed. WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK). Leiden 1974. Pp. 118–163.
- (1857e) ISRAEL (AZRIEL) HILDESHEIMER: The Measurements of Herod's Temple in the Tractate Middoth and in the Writings of Josephus (in Hebrew). Trans. by AZRIEL HILDESHEIMER of: *Die Beschreibung des herodianischen Tempels im Tractate Middoth und bei Flavius Josephus*. Berlin, Jahresbericht des Rabbinerseminars, 1877. Jerusalem 1974.
- (1857f) BEZALEL NARKISS: A Scheme of the Sanctuary from the Time of Herod the Great. In: *Journal of Jewish Art* 1, 1974, pp. 6–15.

- (1857g) ERNST VOGT: Vom Tempel zum Felsendom. In: *Biblica* 55, 1974, pp. 23–64.
- (1857h) HERBERT DONNER: Der Felsen und der Tempel. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 93, 1977, pp. 1–11.
- (1857i) JOHN D. WILKINSON: *Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It: Archaeology as Evidence*. London, New York 1978.
- (1857j) ZE'EV W. RABINOWITZ: Sha'are Torath Babel. Notes and Comments on the Babylonian Talmud (in Hebrew). EZRA Z. MELAMED, ed. Jerusalem 1961.
- (1857k) BEN ZION LURIE: The Antiquities of Jerusalem: the Boundaries of the Temple Mount (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 13.3, 1967–68, pp. 3–17.
- (1857l) CAROL L. MEYERS: *The Tabernacle Menorah: A Synthetic Study of a Symbol from the Biblical Cult*. Diss., Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. 1974. Publ. (American Schools of Oriental Research, Dissertation Series, 2): Missoula, Montana 1976.
- (1857m) YONAH EMANUEL: The Measures of Herod's Temple in Massechoth Middoth and the Writings of Josephus (in Hebrew). In: *Ha-Ma'yan* 15, 1975, pp. 49–54.
- (1857n) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: *Messianism and Mishnah: Time and Place in the Early Hakhlah* (The Caplan Lecture on Jewish Law). Cincinnati 1979.

GOODENOUGH (1828) p. 99, (1829), pp. 212–213, says that Josephus, to be sure in less detail than Philo, describes and evaluates the cult of the Temple in terms of astral mysticism in a way very similar to Philo, though with such variations in detail that we may be sure that Josephus did not draw upon Philo. From this he deduces that the Jews actually made their Temple cult, indeed made Judaism itself, into an astral religion. This, however, we may comment, is pushing the facts too far; if this were so, we should expect some hint of astral religion in the detailed description of the Temple cult by the rabbis, and there is none such. More likely this is simply a widespread symbolic interpretation.

One of the long-standing problems of research in this area is the disagreement between Josephus (War 5. 184–247) and the Mishnah ('Middoth') in their descriptions of the Temple.

HOLTZMANN (1830) presents a balanced picture as to where Josephus may or may not be relied upon. SIMONS (1831), though acknowledging that Josephus' description is a typical example of the weaknesses and inconsistencies of his writings and though expressing particular criticism of Josephus' figures as to distances, is even more critical of the Mishnah, since he says that it is partly an idealization with a view toward restoration. VINCENT (1832) and VINCENT and STÈVE (1833) conclude that, in general, Josephus is more reliable, since, as a priest, he had first-hand knowledge. PARROT (1834) prefers the Mishnah's measurements to Josephus'. BRAND (1835) explains the discrepancies between Josephus and the Mishnah by postulating that the Mishnah is describing the Temple of Zerubbabel, while Josephus is describing Herod's temple. But, we may comment, the Mishnah is not so much describing the Temple as setting forth the ideal tradition if ever the Temple is rebuilt in the future. AVI-YONAH (1836) contends that both the Mishnah and Josephus are describing Herod's temple. Unlike VINCENT, he argues that the Mishnaic tradition, which goes back to a period considerably earlier than Josephus, is more trustworthy, since Josephus wrote when the Temple was in ruins and since he is notoriously inexact in numbers. But, we may remark, Josephus was a priest from a leading family and undoubtedly is speaking from direct experience, whereas the Mishnah,

written at the end of the second century, when the Temple was in ruins, is perhaps, as indicated above, presenting an idealized portrait.

MUEHSAM (1837), p. 6, probably exaggerates when she says that whenever Josephus reports measurements he has proven to be inexact and inclined toward exaggeration; there hardly seems, we must reply, any reason why Josephus should be deliberately inaccurate, and, on the contrary, as a participant Josephus must presumably have had good knowledge of the Temple's dimensions and description: on this see my (1838) review of MUEHSAM. The fact that when it comes to distances in Galilee Josephus regularly estimates and uses round numbers should not deter us.

AVI-YONAH (1839) disagrees with VINCENT (1832) and MUEHSAM (1837) and prefers the Mishnah on the ground that the Jewish sages who compiled it expected that future generations would rebuild the Temple according to the specifications which they had transmitted. They thus had every inducement to be scrupulously exact, whereas Josephus, who wrote for a Gentile audience, had no much motivation.

SAFRAI and AVI-YONAH (1840) compare, though, not systematically or critically, Josephus' description of Herod's Temple with that in the Mishnah and with the archaeological findings.

GALLING (1841) reconciles Hebrews 4. 14 in the New Testament with the descriptions of the Temple in War 5. 207–227 and Mishnah, Yoma 5. 1.

LIEBERMAN (1842), pp. 164–179, comparing Josephus and the Mishnah, accepts the statement of Josephus (War 5. 200) that the Treasury Chambers were behind the innermost recesses of the Temple. He says that War 5. 224 agrees with the Mishnah, Middoth 4. 6, in the description of the scarecrow on the roof of the Temple.

STAUFFER (1843) reconciles the discrepancies in the accounts of Nicanor's Gate in the Temple as found in Josephus and in the Mishnah.

BERGMEIER (1844) understands War 5. 208, without emending the text, to indicate that the gate in the Temple was without a door, symbolizing heaven, the dwelling place of G-d which is hidden but accessible. This, we may comment, which is supported by the Mishnah (Middoth 2. 3), fits in with Josephus' propensity for symbolic explanations of the features of the Tabernacle (Ant. 3. 181–183) and of the high priests's garments (Ant. 3. 184–187).

ZEITLIN (1845) notes that neither the Mishnah in 'Middoth' nor Josephus (War 5. 184–220), both of which give extensive descriptions of the Temple, mention a synagogue. Moreover, the architectural plan of the Temple does not reveal any synagogue. But ZEITLIN should have noted that the Tosefta says that the people went for sacrifices to the Beth ha-Knesseth (house of assembly) and from there to the Beth ha-Midrash (house of study) and from there to the Musaf prayer. It does not say that the Musaf prayer was in the Beth ha-Knesseth.

HOENIG (1846) contends that only after the fall of Jerusalem do we witness the full emergence of synagogues, particularly in Galilee. It is interesting that in the very year in which HOENIG's article appeared stating that no synagogue had been found in Judaea before 70 YADIN should have uncovered a synagogue at Masada dating presumably from before 74, the year of its destruction. We may

note, moreover, that according to the Jerusalem Talmud (Megillah 3. 1) there were 480 synagogues in Jerusalem at the time of the destruction of the Temple (394 according to the Babylonian Talmud, Kethuboth 105 a).

LIVER (1847), pp. 184–188, notes that Josephus (Ant. 3. 194–196) understood the Biblical text (Exodus 30. 11ff.) to refer to the half-shekel contribution brought to the Temple in his own time. While the Septuagint on Exodus 30. 13 gives one drachma as the equivalent of the half-shekel, Josephus (and, we may add, Matthew 17. 24) gives two drachmas. LIVER also comments on the royal order of Antiochus III (Ant. 12. 140) to furnish sacrificial animals, wine, oil, frankincense, wheat, and salt for the Temple. LIVER contends that this statement is contradicted by the Mishnah (Shekalim 1. 5), which indicates that money offered by non-Jews for communal sacrifices was refused; but, we may comment, there is no necessary contradiction, since sacrifices offered for the well-being of a king were accepted from non-Jews.

PELLETIER (1848) (1849) comments on Josephus' word ἐμπέτασμα (Ant. 12. 318, 15. 394) for a curtain, together with the Septuagint's word ἐπίσπαστρον (Exodus 26. 36), which he says was borrowed from the Greek vocabulary of furniture of the period, as inscriptions found at Delos and Pergamum show. The diverse synonyms which are encountered in Greco-Jewish literature appear to indicate that Josephus' word ἐμπέτασμα is not a technical term and that this door-curtain functioned with the aid of a drawing-string.

YEIVIN (1850) notes, but without discussion, disagreements between II Chronicles 3. 1–5. 1, the Mishnah ('Middoth'), and Josephus on the dimensions of the Temple, but suggests that the first refers to the First Temple, while the latter two are speaking of the Second Temple.

FRÜCHTEL (1851), pp. 98–100, comments on the cosmological references in the description of the Temple and of its utensils, a symbolism which, as we have noted above, Josephus shares with and perhaps derived from Philo.

ZEITLIN (1852), citing both the Mishnah ('Middoth') and Josephus (War 5. 184–220, Ant. 15. 410–420), concludes, against WINTER (1853), that there is no evidence that there was a court of Gentiles within the Temple area.

GUTMANN (1854), noting that Exodus 25. 31–40 and 37. 17–24 speak of the seven-branched golden lampstand or menorah to be placed in the Tabernacle but that nothing further is said about this in the Bible, comments that Josephus (Ant. 8. 37), bothered by this lacuna, unjustifiably adds that Solomon made ten thousand lampstands according to the command of Moses. Josephus then resolves the discrepancy between the accounts of Exodus and Kings by remarking, though without Biblical basis, that Solomon had delicately only one lampstand in the Temple, which was indeed similar to the one which G-d had commanded Moses to make for the Tabernacle. GUTMANN concludes that the present confusion between the menoroth of Solomon's Temple and the menorah in the Tabernacle stems from the effort of priestly writers such as Josephus to legitimize the menorah which they saw in the Second Temple.

RENOV (1855) identifies one of the murals of the third-century synagogue of Dura Europos in Babylonia as Herod's Temple and not, as does WISCHNIT-



ZER (1856), the Tabernacle of Moses. The peristyle Corinthian building accords with Josephus' description (Ant. 15. 414). But, as AVI-YONAH adds in a note appended to the article, Antiquities 15. 414 refers not to Herod's Temple but to the royal portico adjacent to it. Moreover, the one undisputed representation of Herod's Temple in the Dura frescoes has a flat roof, whereas this has a gabled roof. Finally, as MUEHSAM (1837) remarks, the fact that the roof was a place where the high priest immersed himself on the Day of Atonement indicates that it was flat.

DU BUIT (1857) has a short, popular summary.

MAIER (1857a), p. 63, notes that the position of the wings of the cherubim in Antiquities 8. 72–73, 103, does not correspond to the position of the Egyptian protecting *genii*. He also compares (p. 74) Josephus' description (Ant. 3. 134ff.) of the long side of the ark with that of the Mishnah, Menaḥoth 11. 6. MAIER (p. 90) says that Josephus' language pertaining to the ark is very much simplified, since he speaks normally only of a κιβωτός.

McKELVEY (1857b), p. 23, commenting on Antiquities 11. 80–81 (cf. Ezra 3. 12 and I Esdras 5. 63–65), notes that the Chronicler states that the leaders and older inhabitants of Jerusalem who remembered the First Temple were disappointed in the one that took its place. He notes (p. 64) that the outer part of the Temple known as the Court of the Gentiles, though not part of the Temple proper, was regarded as holy (Ant. 15. 417, War 5. 194, Apion 2. 103–109). He also comments (p. 72) on the veil of the Temple (War 5. 211–214, 5. 219).

BUSINK (1857c), pp. 36–40, concludes that Josephus (Ant. 8. 61–75) has presented a definitely unhistorical picture of Solomon's Temple, but that for the Herodian Temple Josephus is reliable, except that some measures, as found in the manuscripts of Josephus, are missing or doubtful. He postulates that Titus must have made careful notes of the Temple after he had conquered it and that these were accessible to Josephus. He reviews (pp. 62–75) at length the attempts to reconstruct the Temple and to weigh the account of Josephus against the Mishnah in 'Middoth'. He concludes (pp. 75–76), in a clear exaggeration, that Josephus' scattered remarks about the Temple, in his description of its siege by Titus, have hitherto scarcely been taken into account in the reconstruction. He agrees with my criticism (1838) of MUEHSAM's discussion of the relative value of Josephus and of the Mishnah as sources.

DOEVE (1857d), pp. 122–123, briefly discusses the size of the Temple domain and its government.

HILDESHEIMER (1857e) is a translation into Hebrew of his original publication in German. It includes a brief supplementary bibliography.

NARKISS (1857f) reconstructs the plaster fragment discovered by AVIGAD dating from the Herodian period which depicts the menorah, the table of the shewbread, and the incense altar of the Temple. NARKISS comments on the inconsistency between the depiction of the menorah and the description thereof in the Bible, in Josephus, and in the Talmud.

VOGT (1857g) concludes that the location of the Temple was somewhat south of the Dome of the Rock, that the court of the Temple included the southern part of the area near the Dome, but that its northern part was outside

the Temple court. Josephus, the archaeological evidence, and the tradition about the Temple's location do not require a conclusion that the Dome was the site of the Temple.

DONNER (1857h) concludes that Josephus' statement (Ant. 15. 399) that the Temple was square rests on an error, whether due to imprecision or to presentation of a religious ideal.

WILKINSON (1857i), pp. 70–89, comments on the disagreements between Josephus (War 5. 184–247) and the Mishnah on the description and measurements of the Temple. He prefers Josephus' version, since the latter saw and knew the building, whereas the compilers of the Mishnah were trying to preserve traditions about the Temple which were already at second- or third-hand.

RABINOWITZ (1857j), pp. 45–57, notes a number of points where Josephus elucidates details concerning the Temple in the Talmudic tractate 'Yoma'. For example, Yoma 2a states that "there was a place on the Temple Mount and its name was Birah": this is confirmed by War 1. 75 and 118, which remark that the Antonia castle was formerly called Baris. Again, Yoma 10a speaks of a place called Makedonia, which RABINOWITZ identifies with Mygdonia (Epimygdonia), the city in Armenia which the Parthian king Artabanus gave to Izates of Adiabene (Ant. 20. 68). He also compares Yoma 12b with Josephus' account of the clothes of ordinary priests (Ant. 3. 151–158).

LURIE (1857k) concludes that the discrepancies between the tractate 'Middoth' in the Talmud and Josephus' statements concerning the boundaries of the Temple Mount may be explained by the fact that 'Middoth' goes back to the period of the return from Babylonian exile, even though it was actually transmitted to us through Rabbi Eliezer ben Jacob, a contemporary of Josephus.

MEYERS (1857l) notes the discrepancies between Josephus' description of the Menorah (Ant. 3. 144–146) and that in Exodus, especially Josephus' mention of pomegranates.

EMANUEL (1857m) comments on the Hebrew translation of HILDESHEIMER's (1857e) essay.

WACHOLDER (1857n), commenting on the discrepancies between the dimensions of the Herodian sanctuary as found in the Mishnah (Middoth 2–5) and in Josephus, remarks that the recent archaeological excavations in Jerusalem confirm that Josephus presents actual dimensions of the Herodian Temple, whereas the Mishnah does not. His conclusion is that Josephus' description aims at presenting the recent past, whereas the Mishnah intends to describe Israel's institutions from the point of view of Messianic historicism, projecting an ideal future.

#### 19.14: The Warning Inscription of the Temple

- (1858) CHARLES CLERMONT-GANNEAU: Discovery of a Tablet from Herod's Temple. In: Palestine Exploration Fund. Quarterly Statement, 1871, pp. 132–133.

- (1859) JOHN H. ILIFFE: The ΘΑΝΑΤΟΣ Inscription from Herod's Temple. In: *The Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 6, 1936, pp. 1–3.
- (1860) MOSHE SCHWABE: Josephus and a Phrase in a Letter of a Hellenistic King (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 17, 1945–46, p. 197.
- (1861) ELIAS J. BICKERMAN: The Warning Inscription of Herod's Temple. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 37, 1946–47, pp. 387–405.
- (1862) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Warning Inscription of the Temple. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 38, 1947–48, pp. 111–116.
- (1863) BARUCH LIFSHITZ: Notes d'épigraphie grecque: 2. Une Expression figurée dans une Lettre royale, dans une Loi sacrée et chez l'Historien Josèphe. In: *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphie* 6, 1970, pp. 60–61.
- (1864) BEN-ZION LURIE: *Megillath Ta'anith with Introduction and Notes* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1964.
- (1865) A. M. RABELLO: La lex de templo Hierosolymitano sul divieto ai gentili di penetrare nel santuario di Jerushalaim. In: E. M. ARTOM, L. CARO, and S. J. SIERRA, edd., *Miscellanea di Studi in memoria di Dario Disegni*. Torino 1969. Pp. 199–218.
- (1866) A. M. RABELLO: La 'Lex de templo Hierosolymitano', interdisant aux gentils de pénétrer dans le sanctuaire de Jérusalem. In: *Nouvelles Chrétiennes d'Israel* 21.3, 1970, pp. 31–36.
- (1866a) LEOPOLD WENGER: *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*. Wien 1953.
- (1866b) D. R. CATCHPOLE: The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial. In: *Festschrift C. F. D. Moule*. London 1970. Pp. 47–65.
- (1866c) ALFRED MORDECAI RABELLO: The Lex de Templo Hierosolymitano Prohibiting Gentiles from Entering Jerusalem's Sanctuary. In: *Christian News from Israel* 21.3 (Autumn 1970) 28–32; 21.4 (Spring 1971) 28–32.
- (1866d) ALFRED MORDECAI RABELLO: Lex de templo Hierosolymitano (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 70, 1972, pp. 267–281.
- (1866e) THEODOR MOMMSEN: *Judaea und die Juden*. In his: *Römische Geschichte*. Vol. 5. Berlin 1885. Pp. 487–552.
- (1866f) VIRGIL R. L. FRY: *The Warning Inscriptions from the Herodian Temple*. Diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky 1974.

Josephus (War 5. 194, 6. 125, Ant. 15. 417) reports that outside the Temple there was an inscription prohibiting the entrance of a foreigner under threat of the penalty of death. Such an inscription was indeed discovered and published in 1871 by CLERMONT-GANNEAU (1858). In 1935 a large fragment of a second copy was discovered which is briefly discussed by ILIFFE (1859).

SCHWABE (1860) cites the inscription briefly and presents a parallel contemporary epigraphic text in a letter of a king to the city of Nysa.

BICKERMAN (1861) comments on War 6. 124, where Josephus says that the Romans permitted the Jews to put to death anyone who passed the balustrade of the Temple. What Josephus means, says BICKERMAN, is that in harmony with Greek and Jewish ideas about the right to legitimate self-protection by a community against those who direct divine anger upon the people, a sacrilegious person would be killed by the multitude.

ZEITLIN (1862) protests that the inscription could not be considered a warning according to Jewish law, which must be oral and by name. The reference is to the fact that until the year 65 pagans were not regarded as susceptible to uncleanness, whereas after 65 they were. But, we may comment, neither Josephus nor the inscription says that the foreigner would be put to death

without proper warning: the inscription is merely a preliminary warning. ZEITLIN is, however, right in indicating that the violation is of the law of purification, as Josephus explicitly says (Ant. 5. 194).

LIFSHITZ (1863) calls attention to SCHWABE's article without being aware of the articles by BICKERMAN and ZEITLIN.

LURIE (1864) asserts that this prohibition against foreigners entering the Temple area antedates Roman times and goes back to the return from Babylonia, when it was intended to keep out Samaritans; but, we may comment, there is no evidence to support this hypothesis.

I have not seen RABELLO (1865) (1866).

WENGER (1866a), p. 291, comments on the inscription warning foreigners to keep away from the Temple (War 5. 194, 6. 125, Ant. 15. 417).

CATCHPOLE (1866b), p. 60, comments on the Temple inscription (War 6. 124–126, Ant. 15. 417).

RABELLO (1866c) (1866d) notes that MOMMSEN (1866e), p. 513, n.l, believed that the warning tablets had been set up by the Roman government, since Jewish kings had no cause to threaten death thus. RABELLO, however, stresses that Josephus speaks of them in connection with the construction done by Herod. In answer to MOMMSEN's query as to why a Jewish king would have set it up also in Latin, RABELLO remarks, citing War 6. 125, that the inscriptions were meant to be read and understood by strangers. No source, however, he concludes, gives any ground for holding, as did JUSTER, that the Sanhedrin could condemn a Roman citizen to death. He concludes that such a death sentence was carried out by those present who actually saw the offence; but, we may comment, RABELLO cites no precedent; and, indeed, most probably, as in other capital cases, in theory the penalty may have been death, but in practice it was never enforced.

FRY (1866f), pp. 36–45 and 290–292, concludes that because the agreement between Josephus and the text of the extant warning inscriptions is so close, these inscriptions must be identified with those described by Josephus. The differences in spelling and vocabulary are to be explained by Josephus' stylistic preferences (rather than by differences in epigraphical era) to avoid emphasizing Jewish prejudices against Gentiles. He notes, for example, that Josephus avoids using the word ἄλλογενής (alien) because by his time it had a derogatory nuance. He convincingly concludes that the Jews, rather than the Romans, were responsible for erecting the inscriptions, since Titus (War 6. 124–126) attributes the responsibility for them to the Jews and since Josephus describes them in his account of Herod's construction of the Temple (War 5. 193–195, Ant. 15. 417), though the existence of similar warning inscriptions in the entrance to pagan temples might argue otherwise. On the basis of War 6. 123–126, Fry believes that the Romans did grant to the Jews the right to inflict the death penalty upon any Gentile who defied the warning inscription; but, as RABELLO independently has argued, the authority belonged not to the Sanhedrin but to the Jewish worshippers who had witnessed the desecration.

**19.15: The Half-Shekel Tax of the Temple and Other Donations**

- (1866g) KURT GALLING: Königliche und nichtkönigliche Stifter beim Tempel von Jerusalem. In: Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins 68, 1951, pp. 134–142.
- (1866h) GEZA VERMES: The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in Its Historical Setting. In: Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society 6, 1966–68, pp. 85–97.
- (1866i) FROWALD HÜTTENMEISTER, ed.: Der Toseftatraktat Schekalim. Text. Übersetzung, Kommentar. Diss., Saarbrücken 1970.

GALLING (1866g) deals with donors to the Temple from Alexander on and with the thousand-year-old formula with which gifts were made.

VERMES (1866h), p. 89, deals with the half-shekel tax (*Fiscus Judaicus*) in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in Josephus (Ant. 18. 312, War 7. 218).

HÜTTENMEISTER (1866i), pp. viii–ix, discusses the shekel tax in Josephus.

**19.16: Excavations of the Temple Area (see also 25.12)**

- (1867) JOACHIM JEREMIAS and ALFONS M. SCHNEIDER: Das westliche Südtor des herodianischen Tempels. In: Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins 65, 1942, pp. 112–121.
- (1868) BELLARMINO BAGATTI: La posizione del tempio erodiano di Gerusalemme. In: Biblica 46, 1965, pp. 428–444.
- (1868a) BELLARMINO BAGATTI: Recherches sur le site du Temple de Jérusalem (Ier–VIIe siècle). Trans. by A. STORME. Jerusalem 1979.
- (1869) MICHEL DU BUIT: Au Temple de Jérusalem avec Flavius Josephus. In: Rencontre, vol. 5, no. 20, 1971, pp. 33–36.
- (1869a) BENJAMIN MAZAR: The Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem near the Temple Mount: Preliminary Report of the Second and Third Seasons 1969–1970. The Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1–36.
- (1869b) BENJAMIN MAZAR: The Archaeological Excavations near the Temple Mount. In: YIGAEEL YADIN, ed., Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974. Trans. by R. GRAFMAN. Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 25–39.
- (1869c) J. P. KANE: The Ossuary Inscriptions of Jerusalem. In: Journal of Semitic Studies 23, 1978, pp. 268–282.
- (1869d) JEAN-BAPTISTE FREY: Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaicarum: Recueil des inscriptions juives qui vont du II<sup>e</sup> siècle avant Jésus-Christ au VII<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère. Vol. 2: Asie-Afrique. Rome 1952.

JEREMIAS and SCHNEIDER (1867), in their study of the architecture of the double and golden gates, note that the foundations of the golden gate and of the so-called Tower of David are the only structures extant in Jerusalem from the days of Jesus.

BAGATTI (1868) argues that the site of the Temple was not, as tradition would have it, on the rock rising above the level of the pavement of the present-day Mosque of Omar but rather to the south. He cites in support the observations of Josephus (War 5. 184–247 and Ant. 15. 391–420), the situation of the mosque itself, the position of the rock, the difference in the area's level, the fact that tradition itself never ascribed sanctity to the site of the rock itself, and the fact that the rock is hardly suitable as the threshing floor that was said to

have belonged to Araunah the Jebusite before it became the site of the Temple (II Chronicles 3. 1).

BAGATTI (1868a) has three studies, in French translation, which originally appeared in *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 8, 1958, pp. 309–352, and in *Biblica* 46, 1965, pp. 428–444 (= 1868), on the site of the Temple as reconstructed by Herod. In particular, he discusses the Herodian precinct of the esplanade of the Temple, the Eastern gate, the various levels, the monuments, the sacred rock, and the Antonia.

·DU BUIT (1869) has a very brief, uncritical popular summary of a visit to the Temple site with Josephus as a guide. We may add that excavations in a site adjacent to this area have been going on for some time. If and when the excavation of the Temple itself occurs, to which there are religious objections, it is fair to expect the most important archaeological discoveries that have yet been made in the land of Israel.

MAZAR (1869a) discusses the southernmost gate in the Western Wall of the Temple as described by Josephus (*Ant.* 15. 410).

MAZAR (1869b), using Josephus as a guide, summarizes and discusses the significance of the principal finds, especially of the Herodian period.

KANE (1869c) identifies the doors made by Nicanor the Alexandrian mentioned in an ossuary inscription cited by FREY (1869d), 1256, as the Outer East Gate or Corinthian Gate of the Inner Temple on the basis of Josephus (*War* 5. 201–206), the New Testament reference to the Beautiful Gate of the Temple (*Acts* 3. 2 and 3. 10), and the Mishnah (*Middoth* 1. 4, 2. 3, and 2. 6; *Shekalim* 6. 3; and *Yoma* 3. 1).

### 19.17: The High Priesthood

- (1870) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the High Priests during the First Century of the Christian Era (*Ant.* xviii. 26ff. and esp. xx. 224–251). Appendix S. In: Josephus, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. P. 587.
- (1871) R. A. STEWART: The Sinless High-Priest. In: *New Testament Studies* 14, 1967–68, pp. 126–135.
- (1872) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Die Hohenpriesterliste bei Josephus und die evangelische Chronologie (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften: Phil.-hist. Klasse* 30, 1939–40, no. 3). Heidelberg 1940.
- (1873) VICTOR EPPSTEIN: When and How the Sadducees Were Excommunicated. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85, 1966, pp. 213–224.
- (1874) ARNOLD EHRHARDT: *The Apostolic Succession in the First Two Centuries of the Church*. London 1953.
- (1875) JEHOASHUA M. GRINTZ: Aspects of the History of the High Priesthood (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 23–24, 1958–59, pp. 124–140.
- (1876) HANS J. KATZENSTEIN: Some Remarks on the Lists of the Chief Priests of the Temple of Solomon. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81, 1962, pp. 377–384.
- (1877) JOHN BOWMAN: La Genealogioj de la Ĉefpastroj en la Hebrea kaj la Samariana Tradicioj. In: *Biblia Revuo* 5, 1966, pp. 1–16.

- (1878) MORTON SMITH: *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament*. New York 1971.
- (1879) JEHOASHUA M. GRINTZ: Jehoezer – Unknown High Priest? In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 50, 1959–60, pp. 338–345.
- (1880) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemia. In his: *The Servant of the L-rd*. London 1952; 2nd ed., 1965. Pp. 135–168.
- (1881) JULIAN MORGENSTERN: A Chapter in the History of the High-priesthood. In: *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures* 55, 1938, pp. 1–24, 183–197, 360–377.
- (1882) RALPH MARCUS: The Date of the High Priest Simon the Just (the Righteous). Appendix B. In his: *Josephus*, vol. 7, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XII–XIV (Loeb Classical Library). London 1943. Pp. 732–736.
- (1883) WALTER F. SMITH: A Study of Zadokite High Priesthood within the Graeco-Roman Age: from Simeon the Just to the High Priests Appointed by Herod the Great. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1961.
- (1884) CLEMENS THOMA: Religionsgeschichtliche und theologische Bedeutsamkeit der jüdischen Hohenpriester von 175 bis 37 v. Chr. In: *Bibel und Liturgie* 45, 1972, pp. 4–22.
- (1885) LOUIS FINKELSTEIN: Pre-Maccabean Documents in the Passover Haggadah. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 35, 1942, pp. 291–332; 36, 1943, pp. 1–38.
- (1886) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford 1952.
- (1887) JAN W. DOEVE: Wanneer ontstond de secte van Qumran? In: *Vox Theologica* 39, 1969, pp. 257–287.
- (1888) ADOLF BÜCHLER: Die Priester und der Cultus im letzten Jahrzehnt des Jerusalemischen Tempels (II. Jahresbericht der israelitisch-theologischen Lehranstalt in Wien [1894–95]). Wien 1895.
- (1889) WOLFGANG MÖLLEKEN: Geschichtsklitterung im I. Makkabäerbuch (Wann wurde Alkimus Hoherpriester?). In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 65, 1953, pp. 205–228.
- (1890) ERNST BAMMEL: Joasar. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 90, 1974, pp. 61–68.
- (1891) RUDOLF MEYER: Levitische Emanzipationsbestrebungen in nachexilischer Zeit. In: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 41, 1938, pp. 721–728.
- (1892) GEDALIAHU ALLON (ALON): Parhedroi. Toward the History of the High Priesthood at the End of the Period of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 13, 1941–42, pp. 1–24. Rpt. in his: *Studies in Jewish History* (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Tel-Aviv 1957. Pp. 48–76. Trans. into English: Par'irtin: On the History of the High Priesthood at the End of the Second Temple Period. In his: *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 48–88.
- (1893) HANS ZUCKER: *Studien zur jüdischen Selbstverwaltung im Altertum*. Berlin 1936.
- (1894) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: Was Jerusalem a 'Polis'? In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 14, 1964, pp. 61–78. Originally in: *Erez-Israel* 1, 1951, pp. 94–101 (in Hebrew). Rpt. in his: *The Jews in the Greco-Roman World*. Jerusalem 1961.
- (1895) ERNST BAMMEL: Die Bruderfolge im Hochpriestertum der herodianisch-römischen Zeit. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 70, 1954, pp. 147–153.
- (1896) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: High Priests and Politics in Roman Palestine. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 13, 1962, pp. 14–34.
- (1897) JOSEPH N. DERENBOURG: *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques. Première partie: Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu'à Adrien*. Paris 1867.
- (1898) PAUL GAECHTER: The Hatred of the House of Annas. In: *Theologische Studien* 8, 1947, pp. 3–34.

- (1899) PAUL GAECHTER: *Petrus und seine Zeit; neutestamentliche Studien*. Innsbruck 1958.
- (1900) KARL H. RENGSTORF: Erwägungen zur Frage des Landbesitzes des zweiten Tempels in Judäa und seiner Verwaltung. In: Siegfried Wagner, ed., *Bibel und Qumran: Beiträge zur Erforschung der Beziehungen zwischen Bibel- und Qumranwissenschaft*. Hans Bardtke zum 22. 9. 1966. Berlin 1968. Pp. 156–176.
- (1901) PAUL WINTER: Simeon der Gerechte und Gaius Caligula. In: *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 6, 1954, pp. 72–74.
- (1902) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *Greek in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Life and Manners of Jewish Palestine in the II–IV Centuries C.E.* New York 1942; 2nd ed., 1965.
- (1903) SIDNEY G. SOWERS: The Circumstances and Recollection of the Pella Flight. In: *Theologische Zeitschrift* 26, 1970, pp. 305–320.
- (1904) WERNER GRIMM: Die Preisgabe eines Menschen zur Rettung des Volkes: Priesterliche Tradition bei Johannes und Josephus. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 133–146.
- (1904a) AUGUST STROBEL: Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften: 45. Zur kalendarisch-chronologischen Einordnung der Qumran-Essener. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 86, 1961, pp. 179–184.
- (1904b) JAN W. DOEVE: Le domaine du temple de Jérusalem. In: *Recherches bibliques* 9 (ed. WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK), Leiden 1974, pp. 118–163.
- (1904c) JOHN BOWMAN: The Fourth Gospel and the Jews: a Study in R. Akiba, Esther, and the Gospel of John (Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 8). Pittsburgh 1975.
- (1904d) J. G. BUNGE: Zur Geschichte und Chronologie des Untergangs der Oniaden und des Aufstiegs der Hasmonäer. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 6, 1975, pp. 1–46.
- (1904e) FRANK M. CROSS: A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, 1975, pp. 4–18.
- (1904f) THOMAS FISCHER: Zum jüdischen Verfassungsstreit vor Pompejus (Diodor 40, 2). In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 91, 1975, pp. 46–49.
- (1904g) B. A. MASTIN: Scaeva the Chief Priest. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 27, 1976, pp. 405–412.
- (1904h) MENAHEM MOR: The High Priests in Judea in the Persian Period (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 23, 1977, pp. 57–67.
- (1904i) JEROME MURPHY-O'CONNOR: The Essenes in Palestine. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 40, 1977, pp. 100–124.
- (1904j) GOHEI HATA: *The Jewish War of Josephus: A Semantic and Historiographic Study*. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1975.

I (1870) have a select bibliography on this subject.

STEWART (1871) says that the idea of a sinless high priest has no support in the Bible, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Talmud, or Josephus, and that, in fact, Josephus notes flagrant abuses by high priests. Josephus' portrait of several of the high priests is far from idealized, perhaps, we may conjecture, from personal jealousy as a fellow priest.

HÖLSCHER (1872), especially pp. 9–19, notes the discrepancies between the list of high priests from the time of Herod found in 'Antiquities', Books 15–20, and the recapitulation in Antiquities 20. 224–251, and conjectures that the latter list is based not on the previous survey but ultimately on the Temple archives; but, we may comment, Josephus, who is wont to stress the authenticity of his sources, makes no mention of such archives, and, while he



undoubtedly had some new secondary source, as the additional facts included in *Antiquities* 20. 224–251, show, he was unlikely to have archives in Rome twenty-three years after the destruction of the Temple.

EPPSTEIN (1873) follows HÖLSCHER in regarding Josephus' chronology for the high priests as inaccurate and contradictory.

EHRHARDT (1874), pp. 48–54, says that the list of high priests in *Antiquities* 20. 224–251 is no more than a summary of the preceding narrative. He explains the discrepancies between Josephus' account in Book 20 and his previous accounts by asserting that in Book 20 Josephus referred to a list, probably by Nicolaus of Damascus. But, we may comment, there was no occasion for Nicolaus, a non-Jew, to include such a list in his work and, in any case, Josephus most probably ceased to use Nicolaus as a source several books earlier with the death of Herod.

GRINTZ (1875) supplements the list of high priests given in I Chronicles 5. 29–41 with the information supplied by Josephus (*Ant.* 10. 152 and 20. 231) and Talmudic sources.

Taking issue with GRINTZ, KATZENSTEIN (1876) notes that the longest list of priests of the house of Zadok in the Bible (I Chronicles 5. 34–40) has only thirteen names, whereas Josephus (*Ant.* 10. 152–153) mentions eighteen priests who officiated in the temple of Solomon. We may note that actually Josephus gives only seventeen names here, whereas in *Antiquities* 20. 231 he gives the names of eighteen. KATZENSTEIN argues that the Biblical lists are interested in giving only the priests who were of the family of Zadok, and that Josephus is more accurate. In this case Josephus (i.e., we must say, the version in *Antiquities* 20. 231) is confirmed by the Talmud (*Yoma* 9 a), which says that there were eighteen high priests for this period (the variant reading, eight, is based on an attempt to reconcile this passage with I Chronicles) and which specifically says of Azariah that it was he who served as priest in Solomon's temple and which then enumerates eight priests thereafter, the last of which, Jehozadak, is apparently not counted because he was taken into exile. Josephus starts with Zadok, who is mentioned in I Chronicles as the fourth priest before Azariah.

I have not seen BOWMAN's (1877) account of the genealogies of the high priests.

SMITH (1878) notes that of the few items in Josephus (*Ant.* 11. 297–12. 236) dealing with the period from the end of Nehemiah (432?) to the beginning of the troubles under Antiochus Epiphanes (c. 170), most come from a Jewish tradition hostile to the high priestly family, presumably because Josephus was of the Hasmonean priestly line, which was regarded by their predecessors as illegal. He says that the larger bulk of information which did not survive was actually favorable to the high priests. But, we may comment, the only details that would discredit the high priests are the story of a murder in the temple by a high priest and the account of the building of the Samaritan temple. The high priests fare well in the narrative about Alexander and in the retelling of the 'Letter of Aristeas', both of which are recounted in some detail.

GRINTZ (1879) comments on an inscription of the fifth or fourth century B.C.E. found in 1959 at Ramat Rahel near Jerusalem containing the name of

Jehoezer. Since Josephus mentions three persons named Joezer (Joazar, Jozar), all of them priests, and since in the Talmud and in other inscriptions Jehoezer is exclusively a name of priests, he conjectures that Jehoezer was a high priest or at least a priest of high rank. We may comment that the name is most probably that of a priest, but there is no evidence that he was a high priest; the one Joezer who attained this rank that is mentioned in Josephus was chosen high priest by Herod (Ant. 17. 164), who generally sought new blood in appointing high priests.

ROWLEY (1880), commenting on Antiquities 11. 297, which tells the story of how the high priest Joannes (Johanen) killed his brother Jesus in the Temple, says that Josephus may have withheld the title of high priest from Johanen, though he actually filled this office, because he regarded him as unworthy; but, we may add, in Antiquities 11. 297 Josephus specifically says that Joannes assumed the office of high priest.

MORGENSTERN (1881), pp. 375–376, commenting on the interruption of the offering of the sacrifices in 411–404 after the pollution of the Temple by the Persian general Bagoas (Bagoses) (Antiquities 11. 297), says that with the accession of the new Persian king Artaxerxes II a change of policy toward the Jews and Palestine was inaugurated, which resulted in the reintroduction of sacrifices. But, we may comment, the fact that Bagoas was not replaced would indicate that there was no real change of politics. MORGENSTERN suggests that the mutiny and influential Jews of Babylonia had a hand in this amelioration of policy; but, we may reply, there is no evidence of this.

MARCUS (1882) has a careful discussion of the scholarly literature on the date of the high priest Simon the Just in which he successfully argues, primarily from rabbinic evidence (Jerusalem Talmud, Yoma 6. 3. 43 c-d; Babylonian Talmud, Menahoth 109 b), that Josephus is mistaken (Ant. 12. 43) in identifying Simon as a contemporary of Ptolemy I (323–285 B.C.E.); MARCUS identifies him with Simon II (Ant. 12. 224), who lived ca. 200 B.C.E. and who was the father of the Onias who built a temple in Egypt. In this he is followed by SMITH (1883). Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus 50. 1–6) accords this Simon great importance and honor, and this tends to support the view that it was he who was Simon the Just and that Josephus was mistaken.

SMITH (1883) looks upon the Greco-Roman Age in Palestine as the unfortunate result of the machinations involving the high priesthood. He looks upon the Essenes as a group that split from having dealings with the Jerusalem Temple because of the appointment of non-Zadokite priests, namely the Hasmoneans, and says that it was this rupture that gave rise also to the Pharisees. We may comment that though the Greek Epitome and the Latin version of Antiquities 18. 19 say that the Essenes did not send sacrifices to the Jerusalem Temple, all the manuscripts of Josephus proper in Greek read that they did send offerings there but performed their sacrifices employing a different ritual of purification. There is no indication, we must say, either here or in Josephus' other long account of the Essenes (War 2. 119–163) that the Essenes split with the non-Zadokite priesthood. The evidence that Smith cites from the Dead Sea Scrolls rests upon the unproven assumption that the sect there is identical with the

Essenes. To say that the Pharisees arose in Hasmonean times simply because Josephus' first mention of them is in his account of Jonathan the Hasmonean (Ant. 13. 171) is to ignore Josephus' statement that at that time there were (ἦσαν) three schools of thought, rather than that they arose (ἐγένοντο) then. SMITH theorizes that the Zadokite line re-emerges with Herod's appointments; we may comment that while Herod was opposed to the Hasmoneans and that therefore such a theory is possible or even likely, there is no evidence that they were of the Zadokite line.

I have not seen THOMA (1884).

FINKELSTEIN (1885) notes that Josephus (Ant. 12. 238–240), in his account of the high priest Jason, omits all references to his Hellenizing activities such as are recorded in II Maccabees. ROWLEY (1886), p. 67, and SMITH (1883), pp. 45–63, argue against FINKELSTEIN that the high priest Menelaus was a non-Zadokite priest, pointing to II Maccabees 3. 4 and 4. 23; but, we may reply, there is no evidence for this in either Josephus or in I or II Maccabees or in the Talmud. Josephus (Ant. 12. 238) makes Menelaus the brother of Jason and of Onias III the high priest, as well as the son of Simon the high priest. II Maccabees 4. 25 says that Menelaus possessed no qualifications worthy of the high priesthood, thus implying that he was of the high priestly line. Since II Maccabees is so bitterly opposed to Menelaus, one would have expected a statement that he was not even of the high priestly line, but such a view is nowhere expressed.

DOEVE (1887) identifies the wicked priest in the Dead Sea Scrolls as Jason, although he admits that certain features fit in with the character of Menelaus. The matter, we may respond, must remain *sub judice*.

BÜCHLER (1888) argues that Alcimus (Jacimus) (Ant. 12. 385–413, 20. 235) was not a high priest but actually only a civil ruler. SMITH (1883) rightly disagrees because in such matters Josephus as a priest is hardly likely to be so mistaken.

MÖLLEKEN (1889), noting the discrepancy between I Maccabees, which says that Alcimus was high priest after the accession of Demetrius I, and II Maccabees 14. 3 and Josephus (Ant. 20. 235), which assert that he was high priest under Antiochus V Eupator, concludes, after a careful analysis of I Maccabees 7. 5–25, that his accession to the high priesthood could not have occurred after Demetrius became king.

BAMMEL (1890) surveys Josephus' information about the high priest Joazar, who was a Boethusian, was appointed by Herod shortly before his death (Ant. 17. 78, 17. 164), and was removed by Archelaus for supporting the rebellion (Ant. 17. 339). He returned to influence with the census of Quirinius (Ant. 18. 3) but quickly was overpowered by a popular faction (Ant. 18. 26).

MEYER (1891), commenting on the division in the ranks of the Levites noted by Josephus (Ant. 20. 218), theorizes that the revolutionary movement within Levite ranks must have called forth a most violent reaction on the part of the priests. This, we may assert, is likely, though he does not specify that the priests in particular opposed the Levites, since Josephus strongly insists that the Levites' action was contrary to the ancestral laws.

ALLON (1892) has an excellent critical survey dealing particularly with the annulment of the order of inheritance and of the continuation of the priesthood throughout one's life, the change of the high priests every twelve months, the purchase of the high priesthood, and the appointment of ordinary priests. He notes the anti-priestly reaction present in rabbinic sources; hence, we may add, when Josephus, a priest, agrees with the rabbis on such matters, as he so often does, we may assume that he is trustworthy. ALLON furthermore argues that the ἄρχοντες whom the Emperor Claudius addresses together with the council and the people of Jerusalem in his letter allowing the Jews to keep the high priest's vestments are not the high priests. The new concordance by RENGSTORF, we may comment, indicates that the term applies to the representatives of the political leadership generally, including the high priests; and this is indeed the point of view of ZUCKER (1893) and of TCHERIKOVER (1894), who emphasize that our sources always mention the high priests in the plural and thus stress their political role.

ALLON notes that we know from Josephus, the Gospels, and the Mishnah that the ἀρχιερεῖς, or the sons of the high priests (Mishnah, Kethuboth 13. 1–2, Oholoth 17. 5), formed a kind of organized association which tended to blur and swallow up the personality of the reigning high priest. He notes parallels with the priesthood in the Gentile world, where priests exerted great influence in the appointment of high priests. This is, to be sure, contradicted by Josephus, who constantly speaks about the appointment of high priests by kings and rulers; but Josephus' historical account of this period is truncated.

BAMMEL (1895) compares the brotherly succession of high priests in Jerusalem with similar practices elsewhere in the Hellenistic world; we may comment, however, that in Judaea political and security factors were more important than blood.

SMALLWOOD (1896), after a broad survey of those who held the position of high priest and of their policies, concludes that during the Roman period the high priests had great influence in secular affairs, that they were pro-Roman not because they loved Rome but because they were realists. She takes issue with the suggestion of DERENBOURG (1897) that the short tenure of so many of the high priests was due not only to political expediency but also the unwillingness of many incumbents to tolerate the restrictions of their office, citing the passage in the Mishnah (Horayoth 3. 4) that states that ex-high priests were under the same restrictions as high priests in office. But, we may comment, this passage refers not to the high priest who has been removed from office but to a high priest who for ritual reasons is temporarily disqualified from officiating. She discusses the high priests Joazar, Ananus, and Ananias in particular, noting the differences between Josephus' comments in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities' concerning them. She says that the two portraits of Ananus (War 4. 319–321), where he is praised, and Antiquities 20. 199, where he is condemned) are not necessarily irreconcilable because by 68 Ananus was undoubtedly older and wiser than he had been in 62; but, we may comment, if indeed Ananus had seen the light it would have been to Josephus' advantage to mention this, and yet Josephus says nothing of a change of attitude.

GAECHTER (1898) (1899), especially pp. 71–76, 90–91, 94–103, presents a survey of Annas (Ananus, the high priest during the census of Quirinius) and of his five sons who became high priests. In general, he is skeptical of Josephus' reliability and comments that, as often, Josephus clothes hatred with the cloak of piety.

RENGSTORF (1900) suggests that Qumran was the site of an office of the Jerusalem Temple's administration; but the view is highly speculative, since the sect was so bitterly opposed to the Jerusalem high priests.

The Talmud (Sotah 33a) mentions a Simon the Righteous who is said to have heard a voice from the Holy of Holies in the Temple in Jerusalem proclaiming: "Annulled is the decree which the enemy intended to introduce into the Temple." The account then continues: "Then was Gaius Caligula [the name is corrupted in the text] slain and his decrees annulled." Josephus (Ant. 19. 297) mentions that Simon surnamed Cantheras was appointed high priest shortly after the death of Caligula, but WINTER (1901) suggests that he was fused with the famous Simon the Righteous (c. 200 B.C.E.). We may suggest that the Talmudic passage does not indicate that Simon was high priest: perhaps he was appointed high priest in part because of this remarkable prophecy.

LIEBERMAN (1902), pp. 179–184, points to remarkable parallels in the Midrash (Shir ha-Shirim Zuta, end) which confirm the murder of the high priests Ananias (War 2. 441–442) and Ananus son of Ananus (War 4. 314–318); this confirmation, we may add, is what we would expect, since Josephus, a prominent priest, seems to be extremely well informed about priestly matters. The text of the Midrash is admittedly, however, very confused and inexplicable without Josephus.

SOWERS (1903) conjectures that what impelled the Christians to flee to Pella during the Jewish War was the disgust at the election by lot of the low-born and unworthy Phanni to the office of high priest (War 4. 153–157). But we may comment that undoubtedly, as a priest and as an opponent of such egalitarianism, Josephus was deeply upset by this; whether the ordinary people, including the Christians, would have been upset by such egalitarianism is a question, though, of course, Josephus would have us believe that there was popular indignation. More likely the prophecy that most influenced the Christians, unless it was *post eventum*, was that reflected in Luke 21. 20–21 telling them to flee when the city was encircled: "When you see Jerusalem encircled by armies, then know that her destruction has come near. Then let those who are in Judaea flee to the mountains."

GRIMM (1904) asserts that we can see the pragmatism of the priestly leaders of the Jews from the 'War', above all. He finds the same pragmatism expressed in John 11. 47–53.

STROBEL (1904a) argues from Antiquities 3. 218 that the disputes over the high priesthood were acute, noting that the onyx stone and the breastplate of the high priest ceased to shine two hundred years before the composition of the 'Antiquities', that is, under Jonathan the Hasmonean, 161–143 B.C.E., when Josephus first mentions the three sects (Ant. 13. 171–173).

DOEVE (1904b), pp. 122–123, traces the history and relations of the high priesthood from Ezra and Nehemiah to the outbreak of the war against the Romans.

BOWMAN (1904c), pp. 282–284, commenting on Ananus, father and son, as high priests in Josephus (*Ant.* 20. 197ff., *War* 4. 126–127, 4. 314–318, 4. 180–184), suggests that Annas was deliberately mentioned by the Gospel of John (18. 13) to relate the capture of Jesus with a notable high priest whose influence was felt in the Civil War.

BUNGE (1904d) reconstructs the exact chronology of the high priests from Onias III to Jonathan. He is very critical of Josephus; thus he notes that Josephus' view that an Onias followed Jason is wrong, since this Onias must be Onias IV, who built the temple at Leontopolis in Egypt.

CROSS (1904e), with the help of Josephus, reconstructs the list of the high priests in the fifth century B.C.E. and gives a sketch of the era of the restoration.

FISHER (1904f) argues that we can see in *Antiquities* 12. 414 an indirect recognition of the Jewish high priestly state, since the high priest Judas there is mentioned as having made a treaty of friendship with the Romans.

MASTIN (1904g) notes that *Acts* 19. 14 mentions Scaeva, a chief priest, who is not cited by Josephus, who gives the names of all the high priests. His explanation is that both in the New Testament and in Josephus ἀρχιερεὺς does not always refer to a ruling high priest and can be used in the plural with a wider meaning. Thus Josephus mentions Jesus son of Sapphas (*War* 2. 566), Matthias son of Boethus (*War* 4. 574 and 5. 527), and Ezechias (*Apion* 1. 187) as ἀρχιερεῖς, though none were high priests. MASTIN presents another suggestion, that perhaps Scaeva was high priest of the imperial cult; but he himself answers that, with one exception, ἀρχιερεὺς always appears in a Jewish setting in Josephus. Finally, Apuleius (*Metamorphoses* 2. 28ff.) tells of a miracle worked by a certain Zatchlas. This helps to explain why Scaeva is described as a chief priest, since the seven sons who exorcised belonged to a priestly family; and such a family might normally be found engaged in such activities.

MOR (1904h) comments on the aspersions that have been cast upon Josephus as a source of information concerning the high priests of the fourth century B.C.E. MOR challenges the view that Josephus knew only six Persian kings, whom he tried to pair with the names of the six high priests that he found in Biblical sources. To judge from the Daliyeh papyri and other archaeological finds, Josephus in Book 11 of the 'Antiquities' is more reliable than has been previously thought.

MURPHY-O'CONNOR (1904i) cites Josephus (*Ant.* 20. 237), who says that for seven years prior to Jonathan's assumption of the high priesthood there was no high priest. This is, however, contradicted by I Maccabees 10. 38, which explicitly refers to a high priest between 159 and 152 B.C.E., and hence Josephus is wrong. We may, however, suggest that Josephus is apparently correcting I Maccabees, and on a point where he knew more than we know.

HATA (1904j) remarks that though many scholars have felt that Josephus saw in the death of the high priest Ananus the son of Ananus (*War* 3. 314–318) the

fulfillment of a prophecy in Daniel, this is unlikely, since Ananus was not a person of this quality.

### 19.18: The Clothing and Stones of the High Priest

- (1905) S. VON GLISZCZYNSKI: Versuch einer Identifizierung der Edelsteine im Amtsschild des jüdischen Hohenpriesters auf Grund kritischer und ästhetischer Vergleichsmomente. In: *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 21–23, 1947, pp. 234–238.
- (1906) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *Greek in Jewish Palestine*. New York 1942.
- (1907) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Prolegomenon. In: MONTAGUE R. JAMES, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. New York 1971. Pp. vii–clxix.
- (1908) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Temple and Worship: A Study of the Development of Judaism. A Chapter in the History of the Second Jewish Commonwealth. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 51, 1960–61, pp. 209–241.
- (1909) ROLAND BERGMEIER: *Miszellen zu Flavius Josephus*, *De Bello Judaico* 5, § 208 and § 236. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54, 1963, pp. 268–271.
- (1909a) FRITZLEO LENTZEN-DEIS: *Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern. Literarkritische und gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Frankfurter Theologische Studien, Bd. 4). Frankfurt am Main 1970.
- (1909b) IGNACE DE LA POTTERIE: *La tunique sans couture, symbole du Christ grand prêtre?* In: *Biblica* 60, 1979, pp. 255–269.

An article by a mineralogist, VON GLISZCZYNSKI (1905), attempts to identify precisely, on aesthetic grounds, the twelve stones on the breastplate of the high priest (Ant. 3. 166–168); but, we may ask, how can we be sure that our aesthetic standards are the same as those of the ancients? VON GLISZCZYNSKI casts doubt on Josephus' reliability, but he makes no use of the rich rabbinic literature on the subject and relies upon a translation of Josephus. Moreover, Josephus cannot so easily be dismissed, since he was a priest and lived while the Temple was still in its glory. The best treatment of the topic is one that VON GLISZCZYNSKI had not seen, by LIEBERMAN (1906), pp. 56–59, which concludes, on the basis of a comparison of the names of the breastplate stones in the Septuagint, Josephus and the Midrashim, that the rabbis drew upon an older Greek translation of the Bible which diverged widely from the Septuagint.

I (1907), pp. cxii–cxiv, have systematically compared the twelve stones according to the Hebrew text (Exodus 28. 17–20), the Septuagint, Philo (*Legum Allegoria* 1. 81) for the first five stones, Josephus War 5. 234, Josephus Antiquities 3. 168, the New Testament (Revelation 21. 19), the Midrash (Exodus Rabbah 38. 8), and Pseudo-Philo's *'Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum'* (LAB 26. 10–11). I note that LAB agrees in the names with the Hebrew text eleven times, with the Septuagint twelve times, with Josephus' 'War' twelve times, with Josephus' 'Antiquities' eleven or twelve times, with the Book of Revelation in the New Testament eleven or twelve times, and with the Midrash nine times. In the key matter of the order of the stones LAB agrees with the Hebrew text six times, the Septuagint ten times, Josephus' 'War' six times, Josephus' 'Antiquities' eight times, Revelation no times, and the Midrash four or five times. It is interesting that in the one place where LAB does not agree with the Septuagint, namely in the

identity of stones 8 and 9, it is in agreement with Josephus' 'Antiquities', which is a later version and clearly, to judge from the wording of the passages, a correction of the 'War'.

ZEITLIN (1908) says that because he was himself a priest Josephus' description of the vestments is reliable even against the Pentateuch, so that when Josephus says (War 5. 235) that the high priest had the Tetragrammaton engraved on the plate over his forehead, this is to be preferred to the Bible's own statement (Exodus 28. 36) that the words engraved were "Holy to the L-rd"; but as we have noted above, Josephus focusses upon the main word in the inscription and does not assert that it contained nothing but that word.

BERGMEIER (1909) understands from War 5. 236 that Josephus distinguishes three sets of garments worn by the high priest: his ordinary dress when not performing any sacred function, his priestly garments, and the special garments which he wore on the Day of Atonement and which were plainer than his priestly robes but made of finer linen. In this Josephus is supported by the Jerusalem Talmud (Yoma 7. 1a).

LENTZEN-DEIS (1909a), p. 77, comments on the purity of the clothing of the high priest.

DE LA POTTERIE (1909b) comments on the description of the high priest's tunic (Ant. 3. 161) in relation to John 19. 23–24.

### 19.19: The Effects of the Destruction of the Temple

(1910) KENNETH W. CLARK: Worship in the Jerusalem Temple after A.D. 70. In: *New Testament Studies* 6, 1959–60, pp. 269–280.

(1911) VICTOR EPPSTEIN: When and How the Sadducees Were Excommunicated. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85, 1966, pp. 213–224.

(1912) ALEXANDER GUTTMANN: The End of the Jewish Sacrificial Cult. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 38, 1967, pp. 137–148.

(1913) CLEMENS THOMA: Die Zerstörung des Tempels von Jerusalem (70 n. Chr.) als Wende. In: CLEMENS THOMA, ed., *Auf den Trümmern des Tempels; Land und Bund Israels im Dialog zwischen Christen und Juden*. Wien 1968. Pp. 53–75.

CLARK (1910) notes that, contrary to what is generally believed, the Temple worship continued after the destruction of the Temple until 135, that Josephus (Ant. 3. 224–236) describes the sacrificial cult as though nothing had happened to alter the procedure, and that Josephus elsewhere (Against Apion 2. 77, 193–198 and War 2. 193–198) also refers to the continuing perpetual sacrifices and the continuing priestly service. But, we may comment, pious Jews to this day study the sacrifices as vividly as though they were still being offered; hence Josephus' use of the present tense in Antiquities 3. 224–236 and elsewhere. CLARK cites the statement (Mishnah, 'Eduyyoth 8. 6) by Rabbi Joshua ben Ḥananiah that one is permitted to sacrifice without a Temple as evidence that the sacrifices continued after the Temple's destruction; but since Joshua's statement is "I have heard that sacrifices may be offered even though there is not Temple", the clear implication is that sacrifices were not brought, even though theoretically it was permissible.



Inasmuch as Joshua, as a Levite (Mishnah, Ma'aser Sheni 5. 9), had served as a chorister in the Temple ('Arakhin 11b), for which he had to be at least thirty years of age, he is stating, in effect, that the sacrifices were no longer being offered.

EPPSTEIN (1911) contends, contrary to the commonly adopted view, that the fall of the Temple did not mean the end of the Sadducees. What did effectively eliminate them, he says, was the decree forbidding a Sadducee from entering the Temple. But, we may comment, the bitter opposition and threats of the Pharisees had previously had little effect on eliminating the Sadducees, and we must seek an additional factor for their effective elimination. Only the discontinuance of the Temple sacrifices was a new ingredient in the situation.

GUTTMANN (1912) contends that the destruction of the Temple was only one of three causes for the ending of the sacrifices, the others being the reluctance of the rabbis to revive the power of the priests, with whom they were unsympathetic because of past excesses, and the disillusionment of the Romans, during the war, with the high priests whom they had appointed but who had failed to stop the revolutionaries from discontinuing the sacrifices for the Emperor.

THOMA (1913) warns the reader of Josephus not to deduce that parallel with the destruction of the Temple came a theological decline, since Josephus is partial in declaring that the destruction was divinely ordained as punishment for the frenzy of the revolutionaries (War 5. 566).

## 19.20: The Temple at Leontopolis

- (1914) EDOUARD H. NAVILLE: *The Mound of the Jew and the City of Onias* (7th memoir of the Egypt Exploration Fund). London 1890.
- (1915) WILLIAM M. FLINDERS-PETRIE: *Hyksos and Israelite Cities*. London 1906.
- (1916) ROBERT DU MESNIL DU BUISSON: *Le Temple d'Onias et le camp Hyksôs à Tell-el-Yahoudiyé*. In: *Cairo. Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale* 35, 1935, pp. 59–71.
- (1917) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: *Storia d'Israele*, 4th ed., Torino 1947. Trans. into French by PAUL AUVRAY: *Histoire d'Israël*. 2 vols. Paris 1939. Trans. into English by CLEMENT DELLA PENTA and RICHARD T. A. MURPHY: *The History of Israel*. 2 vols. Milwaukee 1955. Trans. into German by KONSTANZ FASCHIAN: *Geschichte Israels*. Wien 1955. Trans. into Polish: *Dzieje Izraela*. Warsaw 1956. Trans. into Spanish: *Historia de Israel*. Barcelona 1945.
- (1918) JOSHUA BRAND: *The Temple of Onias* (in Hebrew). In: *Yavneh* 1, 1939, pp. 76–84.
- (1919) JAKOB COHEN: *Judaica et Aegyptiaca. De Maccabaeorum libro III quaestiones historicae*. Groningen 1941.
- (1920) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959.
- (1921) MENAHEM STERN: *The Death of Onias III* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 25, 1960, pp. 1–16.
- (1922) HUGO WILLRICH: *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung*. Göttingen 1895.
- (1923) SOLOMON ZEITLIN, rev.: AVIGDOR TCHERIKOVER, *The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic-Roman Period in the Light of the Papyri* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1945. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 37, 1946–47, pp. 89–93.
- (1924) MATTHIAS DELCOR: *Le Temple d'Onias en Égypte*. In: *Revue Biblique* 75, 1968, pp. 188–205 (with postscript by ROLAND DE VAUX, pp. 204–205).

- (1925) MARTINUS A. BEEK: Relations entre Jérusalem et la diaspora égyptienne au 2e siècle avant J.-C. In: PIETER A. H. DE BOER, ed., *Oudtestamentische Studien*. Vol. 2. Leiden 1943. Pp. 119–143.
- (1926) ISAC L. SEELIGMANN: *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems*. Leiden 1948.
- (1927) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: The Orthodoxy of the Jews in Hellenistic Egypt. In: *Jewish Social Studies* 22, 1960, pp. 215–237.
- (1928) WALTER F. SMITH: *A Study of the Zadokite High Priesthood within the Graeco-Roman Age: from Simon the Just to the High Priests Appointed by Herod the Great*. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1961.
- (1929) BEN-ZION LURIE: Who Was Onias? (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 12.3, 1966–67, pp. 65–81.
- (1930) MORTON SMITH: *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (revision of Dissertation for Th. D., Harvard University Divinity School, 1957). New York 1971.
- (1931) STANISLAS LASSALLE: L'histoire des Temps Maccabéens Reconstituée à l'Aide de Citations d'Isaïe. In: *Amif* 1972, pp. 1–39.
- (1932) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans.: *Josephus*, vol. 3, *The Jewish War*, Books IV–VII (Loeb Classical Library). London 1928.
- (1933) GODFREY R. DRIVER: *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution*. Oxford 1965.
- (1934) DANIEL J. SILVER: Moses and the Hungry Birds. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 64, 1973–74, pp. 123–153.
- (1934a) K. M. T. ATKINSON: The Historical Setting of the 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness'. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40, 1957–58, pp. 272–297.
- (1934b) JACK FINEGAN: Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus; an introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha and to some of the areas through which they were transmitted, namely, Jewish, Egyptian, and Gnostic Christianity, together with the earlier Gospel-type records in the Apocrypha, in Greek and Latin texts, translations and explanations. Philadelphia-Boston 1969.
- (1934c) MENAHEM HARAN: *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford 1978.
- (1934d) EDWARD F. CAMPBELL: Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods. In: FRANK M. CROSS, ed., *Symposia Celebrating the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Schools of Oriental Research (1900–1975)* (Zion Research Foundation Occasional Publications, 1–2). Cambridge, Mass. 1979. Pp. 159–167.

The excavation by NAVILLE (1914) and FLINDERS-PETRIE (1915) of a building at Tell-el-Yehudiyeh near Heliopolis which they believed to be the Temple of Onias at Leontopolis has created considerable controversy. FLINDERS-PETRIE defends Josephus against NAVILLE's charge that he has mixed together and applied to one settlement circumstances which refer to several Jewish settlements.

DU MESNIL DU BUISSON (1916) contends that Josephus' description (War 7. 427) of the Temple of Onias as not being like that in Jerusalem but resembling a tower (to correct his previous statement in War 1. 33 [so also *Antiquities* 12. 388] that the temple resembled the one in Jerusalem) implies that it deserved comparison, whereas the edifice uncovered by FLINDERS-PETRIE is too miserable for this. He concludes that the temple was in the camp of the Hyksos. We may, however, call attention to Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 13. 72) that the Temple of Onias, though similar to that at Jerusalem, was smaller and poorer: this

would fit the description of the building uncovered by NAVILLE and FLINDERS-PETRIE.

RICCIOTTI (1917), pp. 231–232, accepting the identification by NAVILLE and FLINDERS-PETRIE, says that Josephus is inaccurate in placing Leontopolis 180 stadia from Memphis (War 7. 426). We may reply that we know of one other Tell-el-Yehudiyeh still further away: why, therefore, not say that Josephus' Leontopolis is still another Tell-el-Yehudiyeh closer to Memphis which has not yet been excavated?

BRAND (1918) examines the account in the Talmud (Menaḥoth 109b) of the events preceding the founding of Onias' temple and discerns three different strata in it.

There has been much discussion as to whether the temple was established by Onias III (War 1. 33 and 7. 420–432) or Onias IV (Ant. 12.387–388 and 13. 62–73). COHEN (1919), pp. 52–58, who notes this discrepancy, says that II Maccabees 4. 30–38 upholds the version in the 'Antiquities'. TCHERIKOVER (1920), pp. 276–277, 497–498, and STERN (1921) draw the same conclusion. But, we may comment, Talmudic tradition (Menaḥoth 109b), which declares that it was Onias III, is not so easily discounted. This is, indeed, the conclusion of WILLRICH (1922), who argues that Onias III was then in the prime of his life, whereas his son Onias IV was only a young inexperienced boy.

ZEITLIN (1923) and DELCOR (1924), who note a papyrus (W. BRUNET DE PRESLE, *Notices et extraits des Papyrus grecs du Musée du Louvre*, Paris 1865, 63, I-VII = VICTOR TCHERIKOVER and ALEXANDER FUKS, ed., *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* 132) addressed to a certain Onias, clearly a grand personage, in 164 B.C.E., thereby conclude that despite Josephus Onias came to Egypt before 164. We may, however, object that the reading "Onias" is by no means certain, since only half of it is preserved; and since the name was fairly common in Egypt there can be no certainty that our Onias is meant.

BEEK (1925) also prefers the version in the 'War' because he says that in general in the 'Antiquities' Josephus is an apologist.

SEELIGMANN (1926), pp. 91–94, argues that Antiquities 12. 237–239 has a worthless tradition with regard to the succession of the high priests after Onias IV and that the version in the 'Antiquities' is not credible because it evinces a Palestinian animosity against Onias' temple. But, we may comment, Josephus' statement (War 7. 431) that Onias was motivated by dishonest motives is no less harsh a judgment than in the 'Antiquities'.

There has been much discussion of Onias' motives in erecting the temple. That his chief purpose was not religious has been well established by TCHERIKOVER (1920), pp. 277–281, who notes that if he had had religious motives he should have selected its site in the greatest city, Alexandria, and not in a remote village that had never been a center of Egyptian Jewry. Religiously, moreover, it was apparently of so little importance that it is never mentioned by Philo. More likely, says TCHERIKOVER, it was established as a military colony, since Onias soon emerges as a general. I (1927) have noted, however, that the fact that the Talmud sees fit to mention it in several places and to issue special rules pertaining to the priests who served in it shows that it was not utterly

insignificant. We may add, as a further motive, what Josephus himself says (Ant. 20. 235–236), that Onias was discontented with having the high priesthood pass out of the hands of his family.

SMITH (1928) concludes that the temple enjoyed a quasi-legitimate status because of a recognition of the legitimacy of its Zadokite priesthood.

LURIE (1929) distinguishes between Onias the Hellenizer and idol-worshipper and Onias who was actually an opponent of assimilationists and built his temple as a site not for heresy but for the worship of G-d when he realized, after fighting on the side of Ptolemy against Antiochus Epiphanes, that there was no hope that he would be able to return to Jerusalem to live according to the Torah. But, we may reply, the Mishnah (Menahoth 13. 10), after some discussion, condemns it, disqualifying the priests of Onias' temple from serving in the Temple in Jerusalem.

DELCOR (1924) minimizes the schism between Jerusalem and Heliopolis; and, in any case, he concludes that the influence exercised by Onias' temple was not considerable. The fact, we may comment, that it is not even mentioned by Philo would attest to this. There is no evidence, however, to support DELCOR's theory that the temple was a means of propaganda utilized by the Ptolemies against the Seleucids.

SMITH (1930), pp. 96–97, cites Antiquities 13. 65–68, where Onias asserts that he found in Syria and Egypt many temples "contrary to what is proper" and therefore sought permission to build one temple, as evidence that Jews were sacrificing in many places before the establishment of Onias' temple. He also cites Antiquities 14. 259–261, where the people of Sardis permit the Jews to offer their sacrifices. But, we may comment, in the former passage Onias is seeking to gain his request for a temple; and, in any case, he does not say explicitly that sacrifices were offered in these temples. If, indeed, there were sacrifices at many temples why would the rabbis single out only the Temple of Onias? As to the decree of the people of Sardis, they could not conceive of a religion except in terms of sacrifices: they were simply misinformed.

LASSALLE (1931) sees an allusion to the district of Onias in Isaiah, chapter 19, and proceeds to assign a date of the second century B.C.E. to it; but, we may remark, the allusions are much too general to warrant such an ascription. We may add that the Talmud (Menahoth 110a) cites Isaiah 19. 19, stating that after the downfall of Sennacherib Israelite princes built an altar in Alexandria in Egypt and offered sacrifices there; but the Talmud makes no attempt to connect this with the later temple of Onias.

Josephus says (War 7. 436) that the temple lasted 343 years. If, as most scholars believe, the temple was founded about 162 to 160 B.C.E., or as TCHERIKOVER (1920) would have it, in 145 B.C.E., and was closed in 73 or 74 C.E., this would make a total of about 218 or 233 to 235 years. EISLER is quoted by THACKERAY (1932), p. 627, as giving significance to 343 as a mystical number ( $7 \times 7 \times 7$ ). Some scholars, such as DRIVER (1933), p. 312, regard this as an error on the part of Josephus. Most likely, we may suggest, this is simply a scribal error for 243.

SILVER (1934) notes that Josephus (Ant. 13. 62–71) makes much of the fact that the site suggested by Onias for his temple was a ruined temple once associated with sacred animals. The Onias correspondence, he remarks, intimates that the revived temple had once been dedicated to Bubastis-Bastet, whose symbol is the cat, the chief enemy of which is the ibis. He attributes significance to the fact that Strabo (17. 1. 29), Manetho, and Apion (Against Apion 1. 250–251, 2. 10–11) all specify Moses as priest of Heliopolis, in which nome Onias had requested the site of the ruined temple.

ATKINSON (1934a) declares that the Dead Sea 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness' was composed in the Jewish city of Leontopolis in Egypt, since it uses the Egyptian solar calendar. He cites Josephus, War 7. 421–436, noting that the fact that Ptolemy Philometor provided the Jewish temple with lands and revenues may have encouraged the Egyptian Jews to believe, as the author of the apocalyptic 'War' did, that the Egyptian king would assist the insurgents in Judaea by invading Palestine by force. We may comment that the solar calendar is hardly due to Egyptian influence, since it is also found in the Book of Jubilees, where Egyptian influence is extremely unlikely.

FINEGAN (1934b), pp. 64–65, comments briefly on the Temple of Onias in Egypt.

HARAN (1934c), pp. 46–47, briefly mentions the temple at Leontopolis.

CAMPBELL (1934d), pp. 164–165, remarks that Josephus mentions the temple at Leontopolis too often – at six different points – for it to be of no significance as an alternative to Jerusalem for Egyptian Jewish loyalty. He agrees with PETRIE (1915) in stating that Onias built the temple with an eye to imitating the architecture and typography of Jerusalem.

## 19.21: The Sanhedrin

- (1935) ELIAS BICKERMAN: The Sanhedrin (in Hebrew). In: Zion 3, 1937–38, pp. 356–359.
- (1936) HANOCH ALBECK: The Sanhedrin and Its Presidents (in Hebrew). In: Zion 8, 1943, pp. 165–178.
- (1937) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Political Synedrion and the Religious Sanhedrin. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 36, 1945–46, pp. 109–140. Rpt. in his: Solomon Zeitlin's Studies in the Early History of Judaism. New York 1973. Vol. 1. Pp. 275–302.
- (1938) HARRY A. WOLFSON: Synedrion in Greek Jewish Literature and Philo. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 36, 1945–46, pp. 303–306.
- (1939) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Synedrion in the Judeo-Hellenistic Literature and Sanhedrin in the Tannaitic Literature. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 36, 1945–46, pp. 307–315. Rpt. in his: Solomon Zeitlin's Studies in the Early History of Judaism. New York 1973. Pp. 303–311.
- (1940) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: Synedrion in the Attic Orators, the Ptolemaic Papyri and Its Adoption by Josephus, the Gospels and the Tannaim. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 37, 1946–47, pp. 179–187.
- (1941) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Synedrion in Greek Literature, the Gospels, and the Institution of the Sanhedrin. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 37, 1946–47, pp. 189–198.
- (1942) I. (= YITZHAK) F. BAER: The Historical Foundations of the Halacha (in Hebrew). In: Zion 17, 1952, pp. 1–55.

- (1943) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: *The Great Sanhedrin: A Study of the Origin, Development, Composition and Functions of the Bet Din ha-Gadol during the Second Jewish Commonwealth*. Philadelphia 1953.
- (1944) HUGO MANTEL: *Studies in the History of the Sanhedrin* (Harvard Semitics Series, 17). Cambridge, Mass. 1961. Trans. into Hebrew: Tel-Aviv 1969.
- (1945) JOSEPH SPENCER KENNARD, JR.: *The Jewish Provincial Assembly*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 53, 1962, pp. 25–51.
- (1946) PAUL WINTER: *Rejoinder*. In: *Commentary* 39, March 1965, pp. 20–28.
- (1947) JOSHUA (YEHOSHUA) EPHRON (EFRON): *The Sanhedrin in Vision and in Reality in the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). In: SHALOM PERLMAN and B. SHIMRON, edd., *Doron: Festschrift Ben Zion Katz*. Tel-Aviv 1967. Pp. 167–204. Abridged English summary in *Immanuel* 2, 1973, pp. 44–49, combining this article and 'The Sanhedrin and the Gerousia in the Period of the Second Temple', *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 1965, vol. 1, Jerusalem 1967, pp. 89–93. Rpt. in his: *Studies of the Hasmonean Period: Seven Topics*. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 250–290.
- (1948) ERNST BAMMEL: *Die Blutgerichtsbarkeit in der römischen Provinz Judäa vor dem ersten jüdischen Aufstand*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, 1974, pp. 35–49.
- (1948a) LEOPOLD WENGER: *Die Quellen des römischen Rechts*. Wien 1953.
- (1948b) C. D. PEDDINGHAUS: *Die Entstehung der Leidensgeschichte. Eine traditions- und historische Untersuchung des Werdens und Wachsens der erzählenden Passionstradition bis zum Entwurf des Marcus*. Diss. Heidelberg 1965.
- (1948c) YEHOSHUA EFRON: *Das Synhedrion und die 'Gerosia' während des zweiten Tempels*. In: *Freiburger Rundbrief* 26, 1974, pp. 158–160. (Trans. from Hebrew in: *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies* 1965, vol. 1, Jerusalem 1967, pp. 89–93). Summarized in YEHOSHUA EFRON: *The Sanhedrin as an Ideal and as Reality in the Period of the Second Temple*. In: *Immanuel* 2, 1973, pp. 44–49.
- (1948d) FRANZ E. MEYER: *Einige Bemerkungen zur Bedeutung des Terminus 'Synhedrion' in den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. In: *New Testament Studies* 14, 1967–68, pp. 545–551.
- (1948e) D. R. CATCHPOLE: *The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial*. In: *Festschrift C. F. D. Moule*. London 1970, pp. 47–65.
- (1948f) DAVID HOFFMANN: *Der oberste Gerichtshof in der Stadt des Heilighums*. Berlin 1877. Trans. into English by PAUL FORCHHEIMER: *The Highest Court in the City of the Sanctuary*. In his: *The First Mishna and the Controversies of the Tannaim: The Highest Court in the City of the Sanctuary*. New York 1977. Pp. 97–203.
- (1948g) HUGO D. MANTEL: *The Development of the Oral Law during the Second Temple Period*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 41–64, 325–337.
- (1948h) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: *Messianism and Mishnah: Time and Place in the Early Halakhah (The Louis Caplan Lecture on Jewish Law)*. Cincinnati 1979.

BICKERMAN (1935) notes that according to Josephus and the New Testament, the Sanhedrin consisted of priests, whereas according to the Talmud, it consisted of Pharisaic scholars. BICKERMAN solves this discrepancy by suggesting that the word συνέδριον in Josephus and the New Testament is used in the sense of the King's Council, and that it has no connection with the Talmudic Sanhedrin. ALBECK (1936) agrees, stressing the difference between Josephus' and the Talmud's usage.

ZEITLIN (1937), however, carefully remarks that whereas in the 'War' the term συνέδριον is used in the sense of "council," in the 'Antiquities', written twenty years later, it designates a Jewish court; like BICKERMAN, he concludes

that prior to the destruction of the Second Temple there were two Sanhedrins, one a political council, and the other a religious body of scholars. In a criticism of ZEITLIN's article, WOLFSON (1938) contends that in Philo, at any rate, the term συνέδριον is used in the sense of a court of justice. In a rejoinder, ZEITLIN (1939) contends that if Philo used the term συνέδριον in the sense of a court of justice, we would have to explain why he used a term unknown to the Jewish audience for whom he wrote; but this, we may respond, is begging the question.

HOENIG (1940) opposes ZEITLIN's theory that the use of the term συνέδριον in the sense of a trial court comes only as late as 93, when Josephus coined this usage in the 'Antiquities', by citing instances of this meaning in the Attic orators, etc., dating from before 70. ZEITLIN (1941) insists that in the 'War' συνέδριον still denotes a council, whereas in the 'Antiquities' Josephus for the first time uses the term to denote a trial court. We may comment, however, that the evidence of papyri dating from the second century B.C.E. cited by HOENIG is decisive in showing that the term συνέδριον did not have the narrow meaning assigned to it by ZEITLIN.

BAER (1942) presents several extravagant suggestions, among them that the Sanhedrin was not a secular political body but an institution to carry out religious reform; he thus groundlessly declares Antiquities 20. 199–203, which speaks of James' condemnation by the Sanhedrin, as an interpolation.

HOENIG (1943), pp. 6ff., concludes that Josephus nowhere refers to the traditional Great Sanhedrin. In Excursus V (pp. 141–142), 'Synedrion in Herod's Trials', on War 1. 537–540, HOENIG concludes that this court was an extraordinary one and has no bearing on the Great Sanhedrin, which was a religious body consisting of scholars.

In a thorough and scholarly work, MANTEL (1944) reconciles the picture of the Sanhedrin in Josephus as a political and judicial body with the picture in Talmudic sources as a predominantly religious body by following BÜCHLER in concluding that there was more than one Sanhedrin. MANTEL argues well (pp. 67–69) that Josephus's statement (Ant. 4. 218) that the Sanhedrin was headed by the high priest and the prophet (here used, as MANTEL rightly notes, in the sense of a scholar) is a compromise between Josephus' ideal of the high-priestly power in the Sanhedrin and the fact of Pharisaic leadership. The Hebrew version of this work has a considerable number of additions throughout, especially pp. 357–365, including how the word Sanhedrin entered the Jewish vocabulary, and an appendix on the judgment of Herod.

KENNARD (1945) comments on Josephus' usage of κοινόν to denote an ethnic assembly or Sanhedrin.

WINTER (1946) comments on the competence of the Sanhedrin to try Jesus and correctly asserts that War 2. 117 and Antiquities 20. 200–203 are less explicit than we should like.

EPHRON (1947), after tracing the history of the Sanhedrin and Josephus' terminology for it, proceeds to distinguish the Sanhedrin from the various administrative councils. He notes that the existence of a central Sanhedrin sitting in the Chamber of Hewn Stones, as described in the Talmud, is not corroborated in Josephus or in any other Jewish source from the period of the Second Temple. Jo-

sephus does mention a people's Gerousia; but, in contradistinction to the Talmud, it is oriented toward the priesthood. His is an ideal picture which was only partly realized in the Second Temple period. The portrayal of the Sanhedrin in the New Testament composed of three classes and led by the high priest finds no confirmation in Josephus or in any other source. There is no contradiction between Josephus and the Talmud, both of which are presenting ideal pictures. We may comment that it is hard to believe that Josephus, as a pragmatic historian first and foremost, could have presented such an important political and judicial institution as the Sanhedrin in anything but a careful, down-to-earth portrayal.

BAMMEL (1948) cites Josephus, War 2. 293, which declares that the Galilaeans appealed to the procurator Cumanus to punish the Samaritans responsible for killing a pilgrim, as evidence that the Sanhedrin did not have this jurisdiction at this time (ca. 50). We may remark that it is more likely that the Samaritans did not accept the jurisdiction of a Jewish court and that, moreover, the Jews sought to have the Romans accept responsibility for law and order. BAMMEL suggests that Pontius Pilate may have been the administrator who, in order to put down unrest, removed capital jurisdiction from the Sanhedrin, and that John 18. 31 may refer to this; this would fit in with the rabbinic statement ('Avodah Zarah 8b) that forty years before the Temple was destroyed the Sanhedrin gave up dealing with capital cases. We may comment that, according to the Talmud, the Sanhedrin voluntarily gave up this jurisdiction because of the prevalence of murderers, and that there is no indication that this jurisdiction was seized from them.

WENGER (1948a), pp. 288–293, remarks on the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin according to Josephus and the New Testament.

PEDDINGHAUS (1948b), pp. 48–65, cites Josephus as a source in his chapter on 'The competence of the procurator and the Sanhedrin'.

EFRON (1948c) concludes that the scheme of the Sanhedrin is, in contrast to the Talmud, oriented to the hierocracy under the priests.

MEYER (1948d) concludes that Josephus' references to the Sanhedrin are too inexact, and that the difference of forty years between the death of Jesus and the destruction of the Temple is too great.

CATCHPOLE (1948e), commenting on Antiquities 20. 200–203, concludes that Josephus is unlikely to be correct in defining the infringing of the law as the convening of the Sanhedrin without the consent of the procurator. Rather, Roman ire was aroused by the high priest's presumption in executing a capital sentence without permission.

HOFFMANN (1948f) contends that the fact that Josephus does not mention the Gerousia in connection with the reception of Alexander cannot be taken as proof that it did not exist, since he finds repeated references to the Senate in the Biblical books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Many pro-Romans, including also some Sadducees, were members of the Sanhedrin, but the fact that a storm arose when they passed judgment according to the Sadducean point of view (Ant. 20. 202; cf. Sanhedrin 52b) shows that such incidents were rare. HOFFMANN is certain that Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel was, as Nasi, in charge of all religious matters.



even though Josephus does not mention this. Indeed, Josephus calls him and Joseph ben Gorion (War 4. 159) the outstanding leaders of the Jews; and coins confirm that he was Nasi of the Sanhedrin.

MANTEL (1948g) remarks that Josephus' failure to mention the Men of the Great Synagogue is not surprising, since, addressing himself to a Gentile audience, he tactfully spared his readers the details of Jewish religious life. We may suggest that Josephus was perhaps saving these details for his projected work on the Jewish religion.

WACHOLDER (1948h), noting that the Mishnah disagrees with Josephus, contends that there is no evidence in Josephus that the Great Sanhedrin had jurisdiction over political matters.

### 19.22: Rabbinic Sages: Onias (Honi) and Pollio (Abtalion)

- (1949) ADOLPH BÜCHLER: Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety from 70 B.C.E. to 70 C.E.: The Ancient Pious Men. London 1922. Rpt. New York 1968; London 1969, 1970.
- (1950) ROGER GOOSSENS: Onias le Juste, le Messie de la Nouvelle Alliance, lapidé à Jérusalem au 65 avant J.C. In: *La Nouvelle Clío* 1–2, 1949–50, pp. 336–353.
- (1951) ROGER GOOSSENS: Les éléments messianiques des traditions sur Onias le Juste, chez Josèphe et dans le Talmud. In: *Bulletin de la classe des lettres et des sciences morales et politiques de l'Académie Royale de Belgique*, 5° series, 32, 1950, pp. 440–469.
- (1951a) SH'MUEL SAFRAI: The Pharisees and the Hasidim. In: *Service International du Documentation Judeo-Chrétienne* (English ed.) 10.2, 1977, pp. 12–16.
- (1952) AHARON (ARMAND) KAMINKA: Hillel and His Deed (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 4, 1938–39, pp. 258–266. Trans. into English: Hillel's Life and Work. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 30, 1939–40, pp. 107–122. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York 1977. Pp. 78–93.
- (1953) JOSEPH LEHMANN: Le Procès d'Hérode. Saméas et Pollion. In: *Revue des Études juives* 24, 1892, pp. 68–81.
- (1954) A. KARLIN: Hillel. In: *Zion* 5, 1939–40, pp. 170–175.
- (1955) AARON KIRSCHENBAUM: Studies in Agency for a Sinful Deed: II (in Hebrew). In: *Yearbook of Jewish Law* 1, Jerusalem 1974, pp. 219–230.
- (1956) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: The Identity of Pollio, the Pharisee, in Josephus. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49, 1958–59, pp. 53–62.
- (1957) DAVID SOHLBERG: Abtalion (in Hebrew). In: SHALOM PERLMAN and B. SHIMRON, ed., *Doron: Festschrift Benzion Katz*. Tel-Aviv 1967. Pp. 21–24.
- (1957a) JACOB NEUSNER: *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*. 3 vols. Leiden 1971.

BÜCHLER (1949), pp. 199–201, accepts the identification of Onias in Josephus (Ant. 14. 22–25) with Honi Ha-me'aggal (Talmud, Ta'anith 23a), who through his prayers brings rain, though the Talmud has a different account of his death.

GOOSSENS (1950) (1951) challenges this identification and identifies, on flimsy grounds, Josephus' Onias, who is given the common epithets δίκαιος and θεοφιλής and who was stoned by the Jews for refusing to curse Aristobulus II while the latter was being besieged by Hyrcanus II, with the Dead Sea Scrolls' much-identified Teacher of Righteousness.

SAFRAI (1951a) cites Ḥoni Ha-me'aggal (Ant. 14. 22–25) as one of the 'men of deeds' of the Talmud.

KAMINKA (1952) accepts the view of LEHMANN (1953) that Pollio the Pharisee whom Josephus mentions (Ant. 15. 3 and 15. 370) as extremely influential under Herod is to be identified with the great sage Hillel, and offers a supporting argument from the Talmud (Kiddushin 43 a), where Shammai is quoted as saying that the man who sends an agent to commit murder is himself liable, just as at Herod's trial (Ant. 14. 172–174) Samaias (perhaps = Shammai) rebukes the Sanhedrin for its cowardice in not condemning Herod for murder. KAMINKA's conclusion is properly contested by KARLIN (1954), who notes that in the Talmud the principle is whether an agent is responsible for his deeds, whereas there was no question of agency in the case of Herod in Josephus. The same point is made by KIRSCHENBAUM (1955).

I (1956) argue for the identification of Pollio in Josephus with the Jewish sage Abtalion, Hillel's teacher.

SOHLBERG (1957) objects, saying that the distance between Pollio and Abtalion is too great, and prefers to derive the name Abtalion from the Phoenician *'eved 'elyon* (the servant of the High G-d); but, aside from the problem of explaining the shift from *ayin* to *aleph* (which were then pronounced differently, and not the same, as is true in the case of most speakers of Hebrew today), we may say that there is no tradition that Abtalion was a Phoenician; rather he was more likely an Egyptian, since in the Mishnah (Avoth 1. 11) he is said to warn the sages to be careful with their words lest they be exiled to a place of evil waters, perhaps a reference to the Nile River and to the fact that Abtalion's teachers had fled to Alexandria during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus. We may further explain the 'A' of Abtalion as the prothetic vowel such as is found in several such shifts, e.g. *'apalyon* (= παλλίον, *pallium*, "a sheet") or, closest of all, *'abtilos* (Bekhoroth 55 a) (= πτόλις = πολίς). For the change of *bt* to *b* or *p*, we may note that Josephus calls Popas, the friend of Archelaus (War 2. 14), Ptollas in Antiquities 17. 219. And, in any case, we may recall that the Midrash (Leviticus Rabbah 32. 5) equates Reuven and Rufus, Yehudah and Julianus, Joseph and Justus (we may also note the double names of the five sons of Mattathias in I Maccabees, pairs which have no philological justification in the scientific sense). One problem remains: in Antiquities 15. 3 Samaias (normally Abtalion's colleague Shemaiah) is called the disciple of Pollio, whereas in 15. 370 they are apparent colleagues. To this we may reply that perhaps Abtalion was the senior of the pair or that perhaps Samaias was Shammai, the pupil of Abtalion. In the Mishnah (Ḥagigah 2. 2) we hear that Shammai followed in the footsteps of Abtalion. Moreover, Shemaiah and Abtalion are said to be descendants of Sennacherib, the king of Syria, which would indicate an Assyrian rather than a Phoenician origin for them.

NEUSNER (1957a), commenting on my article on Pollio (1956), suggests that since the trial of Herod occurs only in the 'Antiquities' and not in the 'War', the relationships and order of Shemaiah, Abtalion, Shammai, and Hillel were unclear, inasmuch as the chain of Pharisaic tradition had not been finally determined by the year 90. Hence, Sameas might stand for either Shemaiah or

Shammai or Simeon. Even so, years after the composition of the 'Antiquities', the exact order of Shammai and Hillel was still under discussion by Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Judah ben Ilai. We may comment that according to NEUSNER the chain had not been determined by the time that either the 'War' or the 'Antiquities' had been composed. Hence, the fact that the trial occurs only in the 'Antiquities' is irrelevant. There is no indication that for Josephus the chain was unclear, since he gives two precise names: it is we who are unclear as to the identity of the names.

### 19.23: Prophecy

- (1958) WALTER BAUER: Das angebliche Zeugnis des Josephus. In: EDGAR HENNECKE and WILHELM SCHNEEMELCHER, ed., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. Vol. 1, Tübingen 1959.
- (1959) ISTVAN HAHN: Zwei dunkle Stellen in Josephus (*Bellum Judaicum* VI, § 311 und II, § 142). In: *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 14, 1962, pp. 131–138.
- (1960) RUDOLF MEYER: *Der Prophet aus Galiläa*. Leipzig 1940.
- (1961) ISTVAN HAHN: Josephus és a *Bellum Judaicum* eschatológiai háttere (in Hungarian) (= Josephus and the Eschatological Background of the *Bellum Judaicum*). In: *Antik Tanulmányok – Studia Antiqua* 8, 1961, pp. 199–220.
- (1962) LLOYD GASTON: No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels (*Novum Testamentum*, Suppl. 23). Leiden 1970.
- (1963) AZRIEL SHOCHAT: On 'The Ambiguous Oracle' in the Words of Josephus (in Hebrew). In: MICHAEL HÄNDEL, ed., *Sefer Yosef Shiloh*. Tel-Aviv 1960. Pp. 163–165.
- (1964) ISTVAN HAHN: Josephus und die Eschatologie von Qumran. In: HANS BARDTKE, ed., *Qumran-Probleme* (Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961). Berlin 1963. Pp. 167–191.
- (1965) JOHN GWYN GRIFFITHS: Tacitus Hist. 5. 13. 2 and the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: *Rheinisches Museum* 113, 1970, pp. 363–368.
- (1966) WILLIAM L. LANE: *Times of Refreshment: A Study of Eschatological Periodization in Judaism and Christianity*. Diss., D. Th., Harvard University Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. 1962.
- (1967) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: When Did Prophecy Cease? (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 17, 1945–46, pp. 1–11.
- (1968) ROBERT M. GRANT: The Coming of the Kingdom. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 67, 1948, pp. 297–303.
- (1969) WILLIAM D. DAVIES: A Note on Josephus, *Antiquities* 15. 136. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 47, 1954, pp. 135–140.
- (1970) FRANCIS R. WALTON: The Messenger of G-d in Hecataeus of Abdera. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 48, 1955, pp. 255–257.
- (1971) JUDAH GOLDIN: "Not by Means of an Angel and not by Means of a Messenger." In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (*Studies in the History of Religions* 14, Leiden 1968). Pp. 412–424.
- (1972) OTTO MICHEL: *Spätjüdisches Prophetentum*. In: *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag*. Berlin 1954; 2nd ed., Tübingen 1957. Pp. 60–66.
- (1973) LUDWIG WÄCHTER: *Der Vorsehungsglaube der drei großen religiösen Strömungen des*

- Judentums, erschlossen aus dem Bericht des Josephus. In his: *Rabbinischer Vorsehungs- und Schicksalsglaube*. Diss., Jena 1958. Pp. 14–51.
- (1974) ERNEST BEST: The Use and Non-Use of Pneuma by Josephus. In: *Novum Testamentum* 3, 1959, pp. 218–225.
- (1975) RUDOLF MEYER: προφήτης: Prophetentum und Propheten im Judentum der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit. In: GERHARD KITTEL, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 6. Stuttgart 1959. Pp. 813–828.
- (1976) REINHOLD MAYER: Geschichtserfahrung und Schriftauslegung. Zur Hermeneutik des frühen Judentums. In: OSWALD LORETZ and WALTER STROLZ, edd., *Schriften zum Weltgespräch, III: Die hermeneutische Frage in der Theologie*. Freiburg 1968. Pp. 290–355.
- (1977) OTTO MICHEL: Studien zu Josephus: Apokalyptische Heilsansagen im Bericht des Josephus (BJ 6, 290f., 293–95); ihre Umdeutung bei Josephus. In: EDWARD EARLE ELLIS and MAX WILCOX, edd., *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edinburgh 1969. Pp. 240–244.
- (1978) J. REILING: The Use of ψευδοπροφήτης in the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus. In: *Novum Testamentum* 13, 1971, pp. 147–156.
- (1979) J. REILING: Hermas and Christian Prophecy: A Study of the Eleventh Mandate (*Supplements to Novum Testamentum*, 37). Leiden 1973. Pp. 75–76.
- (1980) JOSEPH COPPENS: Le prophète eschatologique. L'annonce de sa venue. Les relectures. In: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 49, 1973, pp. 5–35.
- (1981) JOSEPH BLENKINSOPP: Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, 1974, pp. 239–262.
- (1982) GERHARD DELLING: Die biblische Prophetie bei Josephus. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 109–121.
- (1983) OTTO BETZ: Das Problem des Wunders bei Flavius Josephus im Vergleich zum Wunderproblem bei den Rabbinen und im Johannesevangelium. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 23–44.
- (1984) MARIANUS DE JONGE: Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 205–219.
- (1984a) HANS-J. SCHOEPS: Die jüdischen Prophetenmorde (*Symbolae Biblicae Upsalienses, Supplementhäften till svensk Exegetisk Årsbok*, 2). Zürich and Uppsala 1943. Rpt. in his: *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Tübingen 1950. Pp. 126–143.
- (1984c) MICHA J. BIN GORION (BERDICHEVSKY): Yesu ben Hanan (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1959.
- (1984d) ODIL H. STECK: Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum. Neukirchen-Vluyn 1967.
- (1984e) JOHANNES LINDBLOM: Gesichte und Offenbarungen. Vorstellungen von göttlichen Weisungen und übernatürlichen Erscheinungen im ältesten Christentum (*Acta Reg. Societatis humaniorum litterarum Lundensis*, 65). Lund 1968.
- (1984f) OTTO MICHEL: Zur Methodik der Forschung. In: *Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. Preface by H. VAN PRAAG. Assen 1969. Pp. 1–11.
- (1984g) D. R. CATCHPOLE: The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial. In: *Festschrift C. F. D. Moule*, London 1970. Pp. 47–65.
- (1984h) P. VIELHAUER: Apokalypsen und Verwandtes. In: EDGAR HENNECKE and WILHELM SCHNEEMELCHER, edd., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, Vol. 2, 4th ed. Tübingen

1971. Pp. 405–427. Trans. into English by R. McL. WILSON. Vol. 2. Philadelphia 1964. Pp. 601–605.
- (1984i) THOMAS WILLI: *Die Chronik als Auslegung: Untersuchungen zur literarischen Gestaltung der historischen Überlieferung Israels* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 106). Göttingen 1972.
- (1984j) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: *The Sages. Their Concepts and Beliefs*. 2 vols. Jerusalem 1975.
- (1984k) ULRICH FISCHER: *Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum* (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 44, Berlin 1978). First presented as diss., Heidelberg 1977: *Studien zur Eschatologie des hellenistischen Diasporajudentums*.
- (1984l) LESTER L. GRABBE: *Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography*. In: PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER, ed., *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, vol. 2. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 43–68.
- (1984m) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *Josephus and Daniel*. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4, 1965, pp. 148–162.
- (1984n) NAHUM N. GLATZER: *A Study of the Talmudic Interpretation of Prophecy*. In: *Review of Religion* 10, 1945–46, pp. 115–137. Rpt. in: *Essays in Jewish Thought* (Judaic Studies Series, 8). University, Alabama 1978. Pp. 16–35.
- (1984o) GOHEI HATA: *The Jewish War of Josephus: A Semantic and Historiographic Study*. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1975.
- (1984p) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *The Romans through Jewish Eyes*. In: *Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon*. Paris 1978. Pp. 3–12.

BAUER (1958), pp. 324–325, comments that the parallelisms and other Semiticisms in the style of the prophecy of War 6. 301 show that it is authentic. As to the prophecy in Antiquities 15. 374–378, its Hellenistic terminology makes it probable that Josephus does not cite the oracle verbatim but that he formulated it independently.

HAHN (1959) attempts, on the basis of Yoma 39 b, where Joḥanan ben Zakkai refers to the Temple as Lebanon, which can mean square, to explain the prophecy that Jerusalem would fall when the Temple would have the form of a square.

MEYER (1960), pp. 52–58, in his discussion of Messianic prophecy in Josephus, tries to connect the prophecy (War 6. 312) of the coming of a world-ruler with Daniel 7. 13–14. This passage in Daniel, we may remark, was understood in Josephus' day to refer to the Messiah, and it could hardly have been interpreted by Josephus to refer to the Roman Empire, since it predicts that the dominion would be everlasting. More likely Josephus is referring to Daniel, chapters 11–12, which the Rabbis understood to refer to Roman conquests, or, as HAHN (1961) and GASTON (1962), pp. 458–462, suggest, to Daniel 9. 24–27, which calculates cryptically that the Messiah is to come 490 years after the destruction of the First Temple, a chronology, as Hahn asserts, derived from priestly records known to Josephus. Hahn comments that the information of Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius predicting the Messiah's coming is based on a common source, namely the oral information of Josephus in 67/68 and the commentary of Vespasian, and that the opposing parties, both the friends and opponents of Rome, used such predictions to influence the masses. MEYER says

that Josephus does not mention Daniel in connection with the prophecy of the coming of a world-ruler; but, we may note, in *Antiquities* 10. 276 Josephus writes: "In the same manner Daniel also wrote about the empire of the Romans and that Jerusalem would be taken by them and the Temple laid waste" (the clause about Jerusalem is found only in the excerpt in John Chrysostom, *Adversus Judaeos* 5.8–10) (*Patrologia Graeca* 48. 896–900). Of course, we may add, the prophecy of a world-ruler was widespread, as we see in its mention in Suetonius (Vespasian 4) and Tacitus (*Histories* 5. 13), and need not have come immediately from Daniel.

SHOCHAT (1963), commenting on the ambiguous oracle in *War* 6. 312, says that Josephus is referring to the prophecy in *Isaiah* 10. 33–34; but, we may comment, this is unlikely, since the prophecy in the 'War' predicts that "at that time" someone would become ruler of the world. In *Isaiah* there is no prediction for a given time, whereas in Daniel, in its very cryptic way, there is such a prediction.

HAHN (1964), commenting on this oracle in *Antiquities* 6. 312 and on Josephus' alleged skill in interpreting such prophecies (*War* 3. 352), thinks that this prediction, which influenced Jewish insurgents to take up arms against the Romans, may have been of Essene origin. Equating the Qumran sect with the Essenes, he says that the Qumran interests in eschatology and chronology speak for a connection with this oracle. GRIFFITHS (1965) similarly argues that the Dead Sea sect was the source of this prophecy; but, we may comment, Josephus, who writes at great length about the Essenes (*War* 2. 119–163), nowhere mentions their connection with this oracle; nor, for that matter, do Suetonius and Tacitus mention the sect in this connection. If, indeed, it was the Essenes who triggered the revolution through this oracle, it is hardly likely that Josephus would have been so favorably disposed toward them. The fact that Josephus, Suetonius, Tacitus, and the Talmud (through Joḥanan ben Zakkai) all interpret the prophecy as applying to Vespasian shows, as GRIFFITHS correctly points out, that the prophecy could not originally have been openly and explicitly anti-Roman; hence, we must say, to ascribe its origin to the Essenes and/or the Dead Sea Sect seems unwarranted.

LANE (1966), pp. 283–299, thinks that the prophecy in Josephus, Suetonius, and Tacitus refers to Daniel 2. 44; but this again is hardly likely, since that passage refers to a kingdom which shall never be destroyed; and a Jew, even one so enamored of Rome, could hardly have said this about any nation other than Israel.

URBACH (1967) writes that whereas, according to the rabbis, prophecy ceased in the period of the Second Temple, Josephus speaks of prophecy as still being current in the period of John Hyrcanus (*War* 1. 68–69; *Ant.* 13. 299–300). That this, we may add, was not merely in order to impute the possibility of prophecy to himself may be seen from the fact that Josephus is not alone in regarding prophecy as still being practiced in this period, as is clear from the Testament of Levi 8. 11–15, which URBACH cites, to which we may add references in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *bath kol* in the Talmud which several sages hear from heaven and which is similar to, but a substitute for, prophecy.

GRANT (1968) notes that the eschatological pattern of Jesus is paralleled in the story of the false prophet from Egypt (Ant. 20. 169).

DAVIES (1969), commenting on Antiquities 15. 136, which states that the Jews have learned the laws from ἄγγελοι sent by G-d, suggests that ἄγγελοι refers not to the angels but to the prophets, and that, in any case, there is no idea here that Judaism anticipated a new Torah in its ideal future. Confirmation of this translation of ἄγγελοι would appear to be found in a fragment of Hecataeus of Abdera (ap. Diodorus 40. 3), who speaks of the high priest as ἄγγελον τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ προσταγμάτων, as noted by WALTON (1970). In addition, we may note that the traditional rabbinic exegesis, as seen for example in the commentary of Rashi on Numbers 20. 16 ("And when we cried unto the L-rd, He heard our voice and sent an angel"), identifies the angel (*malakh*) as Moses. The Sifra 112c, which is commented upon by GOLDIN (1971), pp. 419–420, remarks that Moses was found worthy of being made the messenger (or, according to Avot de-Rabbi Nathan 1.1, the middleman) between Israel and G-d. The context of Antiquities 15. 136, we may add, confirms the translation "messengers", since Herod, who is here addressing his troops, is contrasting the Greek mistreatment of the Jewish envoys despite the fact that they declare heralds inviolate and despite the fact that the Jews have learned the Torah through messengers sent by G-d; the equation is of human heralds with the presumed human heralds who transmitted G-d's Torah.

MICHEL (1972) stresses the Hellenized portrait of prophecy that appears in Josephus and the distinction between the religious prophecy of salvation and the political Messianic prophecy. This, we may add, is part of Josephus' general outlook in his attempt to divorce religion from nationalism.

I have not seen WÄCHTER (1973).

BEST (1974) notes that the use of θεῖον πνεῦμα in Josephus, as in post-Biblical Judaism generally, is restricted to prophecy within the Biblical period and that when the Hebrew word *ruah* refers to G-d, Josephus, like the Septuagint and Philo, is more likely to render it as πνεῦμα than when it refers to the spirit of man.

MEYER (1975) is particularly concerned with prophecy in dreams, especially as reflected in Antiquities 17. 345–354.

MAYER (1976), pp. 322–327, notes that Josephus was working within a priestly-prophetic tradition, as War 3. 350–354 shows.

MICHEL (1977) notes that Josephus regards as ignorant those (War 6. 291) who interpreted the portents preceding the fall of the Temple as good omens, whereas he shares the view of those who correctly understood them to refer to the forthcoming destruction. MICHEL deduces from this that Josephus adhered to the priestly, rather than to prophetic, apocalyptic tradition; but we may remark that Josephus draws no such contrast; those who misinterpret the portents are inexperienced (ἀπειροίς), whereas those who correctly interpret them are sacred scribes (ιερογραμματεῖσι), with no indication that the latter group are necessarily priests.

REILING (1978) remarks that in the Septuagint and Philo false prophecy is associated chiefly with pagan divination, whereas in Josephus divinatory

terms, such as μάντις and its derivatives, have lost the connotation of paganism; perhaps, we may comment, this reflects a difference between Alexandrian and Palestinian usage, since Josephus' practice is paralleled in the Talmud.

REILING (1979) adds that inasmuch as political prophecy had ceased, the divinatory element had come to the fore, and indeed Josephus' account of his own prophetic achievements is reminiscent of divination (War 3. 351–354). In contrast, the false prophets mentioned by Josephus are political or Messianic in nature.

COPPENS (1980), surveying, in tendentious fashion, the history of eschatological prophecy, concludes that no character in the history of exegesis from the Bible to Josephus and Qumran appears who may be called a true prototype of Jesus.

The latest and most comprehensive treatment of prophecy in Josephus, by BLENKINSOPP (1981), stresses the close relationship in Josephus between prophecy and the priestly state, both of which Josephus claimed (Ant. 3. 192). That indeed there is such a close relationship in Josephus may be seen from the fact that Josephus' interpretation of Deuteronomy 17. 9, which refers to the high court as consisting of the priests and "the judge that shall be in those days", goes contrary to the plain meaning of the text in coupling the high priest and prophet as the components of the court. BLENKINSOPP stresses that while it is true that Josephus was deeply influenced by the cultural milieu of Hellenism, he wrote as a Jew. While he never uses the word προφήτης with reference to contemporary seers, the kinship which he sees between prophets and historians will explain his attribution of historical books to prophetic authors; the fact, we may comment, that the prophetic books are grouped with the historical books in the three-fold division of the Jewish Scriptures may have influenced this view. Moreover, as BLENKINSOPP rightly stresses, the fact that the Pharisees, with whom Josephus identified himself, regarded themselves as heirs of the prophets may have influenced him. We may, however, note that there is a skepticism toward prophets in rabbinic literature, so that we hear (Sifra 27. 34) that a prophet may no longer make any innovations. BLENKINSOPP notes the importance of dreams in Josephus and suggests that Josephus may have been influenced by the fact that dreams were important for his namesake, Joseph, in Genesis. He suggests that Jeremiah may have served as a model for Josephus in his conduct during the war against the Romans; and, indeed, the equation is explicit in Josephus' speech to the Jews in War 5. 391–392. BLENKINSOPP is surprised that Josephus devoted so little space to the prophets; but we may explain that Josephus is writing a history, whereas the chief burden of the prophets is ethical exhortation; moreover, he is writing for rational Greek readers who might have found prophecy difficult to accept.

DELLING (1982), independently of BLENKINSOPP, presents a survey of the role and functions of the prophet, of Josephus' statements regarding Balaam and the various Biblical prophets, and of the method of identifying a true prophet in Josephus, and in particular studies Josephus' terminology.

BETZ (1983) compares the prophet-role of Elijah as presented in Josephus (Ant. 8. 349ff.) and of Josephus at Jotapata (War 3. 350–354). He contends



that the portrait of Elijah has been influenced by Josephus' attitude toward the Zealots.

DE JONGE (1984) correctly remarks that Josephus in his first speech before the walls of Jerusalem (War 5. 362–419) implies a comparison with the prophet Jeremiah.

SCHOEPS (1984a), pp. 7–8, and (1984b), p. 130, commenting on Antiquities 10. 38, regarding King Manasseh's slaughter of the prophets, says that this paraphrase, full of fantasy, of the text of the Bible shows the role that the theme of the murder of the prophets played in the folk consciousness. SCHOEPS (1984a), p. 17, and (reprint), p. 138, also comments on the prophecy of Zacharias ben Baris as a prophecy *ex eventu* (War 4. 335).

BIN GORION (1984c) argues unconvincingly that Jesus, the son of Ananias (War 6. 300–309), who for seven years prior to the fall of the city called woe over Jerusalem, is the historical Jesus of Nazareth.

STECK (1984d), pp. 81–86, comments on the tradition of the Deuteronomic prophecy in Josephus (Ant. 9. 265–267, 9. 281, 10. 38–39, 10. 60).

LINDBLOM (1984e), pp. 168–172, concludes that the prophets wrote from the time of the death of Moses to the reign of Artaxerxes, but that thereafter (Apion 1. 40–41) there was no precise line of prophets. He notes that Josephus avoids the term *προφήτης* and that he uses other expressions for John the Baptist (Ant. 18. 116–119). He himself knows of inspiration by dreams (War 3. 300–304).

MICHEL (1984f), pp. 10–11, comments on Josephus' prophecy that Vespasian would become emperor (War 3. 400), as well as on the portents accompanying the destruction of the Temple (War 6. 290, 293).

CATCHPOLE (1984g), pp. 61–62, comments on the prophecy of Jesus the son of Ananias (War 6. 300–309).

VIELHAUER (1984h), pp. 422–424 (English translation, pp. 601–605), comments on Josephus as a source for Jewish prophecy in the period of the New Testament. He says that Judaism in the Hellenistic-Roman period was by no means without prophets. According to Josephus, they were to be found among the Essenes, the Pharisees, and the Zealots. The tendency of Josephus to give a Hellenized picture of Judaism and to conceal Jewish messianism as much as possible makes it difficult to find the personal awareness of those figures who are called false leaders by him. He presents with sympathetic understanding only the Essene and Pharisaic soothsayers and prophets of doom. For this reason, he contends, we are poorly informed concerning the form of prophetic statements.

WILLI (1984i) has frequent references, especially pp. 242–244, on prophecy in Josephus.

URBACH (1984j), pp. 666–667, discusses the prophets of the destruction of the Temple in Josephus.

FISCHER (1984k), pp. 157–163, postulates that the ambiguous oracle (War 6. 312–313) that someone coming from Judaea would rule the world had a pagan source which had a list of prodigies, and that this source was also used by Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio. He also explains, pp. 168–174, the relationship of the prophecy of Jotapata (War 3. 350–354, 399–408) to the ambiguous oracle

(War 6. 312–313) and discusses Josephus' silence about Messianic expectations. He also comments, pp. 174–183, on the suppression of Daniel's prophecy by Josephus (Ant. 10. 186–281) and the interpretation of Daniel 2. 27ff. in *Antiquities* 10. 203–210.

GRABBE (1984l) follows BRUCE (1984m) in his interpretation of two oracles in Josephus (War 6. 311, 6. 312–313) which may have Daniel 9. 24–27 behind them and concludes that Josephus is a witness to a widespread belief that the seventy-weeks prophecy was being fulfilled in the Jewish war. Josephus himself, he adds, was a member of a stratum of Jewish society which was less likely to be influenced by such apologetic speculations; yet we cannot rule out a closer identification of Josephus' own opinions with such speculations in his earlier life, that is before the war turned against the Jews.

GLATZER (1984n) remarks that Josephus reports many prophets and visionaries who promised liberation from the Roman yoke and who predicted the doom of Jerusalem, and notes that Josephus himself at times assumes the role of a prophet.

HATA (1984o) suggests that the prophecies in Josephus concerning the destruction of the Temple were taken from the Bible rather than from the fourth book of the Sibylline Oracles, as THACKERAY indicated.

BRUCE (1984p) concludes that Josephus, like Philo, believed that Roman rule in itself was a good and divinely-ordained dispensation, that the collapse of good relations between the Romans and the Jews was to be blamed on unworthy governors and insensate rebels, and yet that even for Josephus Roman rule would not last forever (Ant. 10. 210).

## 19.24: False Prophets

(1984q) HANS-J. SCHOEPS: *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Tübingen 1950.

(1984r) OTTO MICHEL: *Zur Methodik der Forschung*. In: *Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. Preface by H. VON PRAAG. Assen 1969. Pp. 1–11.

(1984s) DAVID ROKEAH: *Ben Stada is Ben Pantera—Towards the Clarification of a Philological-Historical Problem* (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 39, 1969–70, pp. 9–18.

(1984t) R. TRAVERS HERFORD: *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*. London 1903.

(1984u) JACOB Z. LAUTERBACH: *Jesus in the Talmud*. In his: *Rabbinic Essays*. Cincinnati 1951. Pp. 473–570.

(1984v) PIERRE GRELOT: *L'Espérance juive à l'Heure de Jésus* (Collection 'Jésus et Jésus-Christ', 6). Paris 1978.

SCHOEPS (1984q), p. 240, comments on the Egyptian pseudo-prophet (War 2. 261–263, Ant. 20.169–172). He remarks also on the similarity among Josephus (Ant. 4. 104–130), Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 1. 54) and the Talmud in their portraits of Balaam. He speculates on the possible identification of the Egyptian pseudo-prophet in Josephus with the Talmudic Ben Stada (*Shabbath* 104b).

MICHEL (1984r), p. 3, comments on the false prophet (War 6. 285–287) who had deluded six thousand refugees at the time of the destruction of the Temple.

ROKEAH (1984s) rejects the affinity, alleged by HERFORD (1984t) and LAUTERBACH (1984u), of Jesus to the Egyptian magician and pseudo-prophet (War 2. 261–263, Ant. 20. 169–172; cf. Acts 21. 38) and to the Talmudic Ben Stada, who is said to have smuggled magical charms out of Egypt by tattooing them on his body (Tosefta Shabbath 11. 15) and who is identified with Ben Pantera (Sanhedrin 67a, Shabbath 104b). ROKEAH notes that a late, unique Christian tradition (Matthew 2. 15–23) tells of Jesus' escape to Egypt and his subsequent return to Nazareth. Throughout the New Testament Jesus' divinity is based on his supernatural deeds. The rabbis retorted by accusing Jesus of sorcery (Sanhedrin 43a, uncensored version) and, using the Christian tradition, claimed that Egypt, the land of sorcery (Kiddushin 49b), and not his divine origin, was the source of Jesus' skill. This allegation was echoed by Celsus (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, 1. 28).

GRELOT (1984v), pp. 129–142, comments on the false prophet Theudas (Ant. 20. 97–98), the false Egyptian prophet (Ant. 20. 168–171), and the Samaritan prophet (Ant. 18. 85).

### 19.25: Miracles

- (1985) WILLIAM WARBURTON: *The Divine Legation of Moses Demonstrated*. 2 vols. London 1738–41; 2nd ed., 1742.
- (1986) ISAAK HEINEMANN: *Die Kontroverse über das Wunder im Judentum der hellenistischen Zeit*. In: ALEXANDER SCHEIBER, ed., *Jubilee Volume in Honour of Professor Bernhard Heller on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*. Budapest 1941. Pp. 170–191.
- (1987) ROBERT M. GRANT: *Miracle and Natural Law in Graeco-Roman and Early Christian Thought*. Amsterdam 1952.
- (1988) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (1989) OTTO BETZ: *Jesu Heiliger Krieg*. In: *Novum Testamentum* 2, 1957, pp. 116–137.
- (1990) GERHARD DELLING: *Josephus und das Wunderbare*. In: *Novum Testamentum* 2, 1957–58, pp. 291–309. Rpt. in: FERDINAND HAHN et al., edd., *Gerhard Delling: Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum; gesammelte Aufsätze 1950–1968*. Göttingen 1970. Pp. 130–145.
- (1991) KARL H. RENGSTORF: *σημείον*. *Das außerbiblische griechische Judentum*. In: GERHARD KITTEL, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 7. Stuttgart 1964. Pp. 221–223 (English trans., pp. 223–225).
- (1992) KARL H. RENGSTORF: *τέρας*. In: GERHARD KITTEL, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 8. Stuttgart 1969. Pp. 113–127 (English trans., pp. 113–126).
- (1993) GEORGE (W.) MACRAE: *Miracle in The Antiquities of Josephus*. In: CHARLES F. D. MOULE, *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History*. London 1965. Pp. 127–147.
- (1994) GERT AVENARIUS: *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*. Meisenheim/Glan 1956.
- (1995) WAYNE A. MEEKS: *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Leiden 1967.
- (1996) DAVID L. TIEDE: *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker*. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1970. Publ.: (Society of Biblical Literature, Dissertation Series, no. 1) Missoula, Montana 1972.

- (1997) HORST R. MOEHRING: Rationalization of Miracles in the Writings of Flavius Josephus. In: *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 112, 1973 (= *Studia Evangelica*, 6), pp. 376–383.
- (1998) OTTO BETZ: Das Problem des Wunders bei Flavius Josephus im Vergleich zum Wunderproblem bei den Rabbinen und im Johannesevangelium. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 23–44.
- (1999) JACK D. SPIRO: Josephus and Colleagues: No Escape from the Mores of the Age. In: *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal* 21. 3, Summer 1974, pp. 71–79.
- (2000) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (2000a) HANS LEWY: Tacitus on the Antiquity of the Jews and Their Character (in Hebrew). In: *Studies in Jewish Hellenism*. Jerusalem 1969. Pp. 115–196.
- (2000b) J. M. VAN CANGH: La multiplication des pains dans l'évangile de Marc: Essai d'exégèse globale. in: *L'Évangile selon Marc: Tradition et rédaction (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 34; Journées bibliques de Louvain 22, 1971, ed. M. SABBE)*. Gembloux, 1974, pp. 309–346.
- (2000c) K. FERRARI D'OCCHIEPPO: *Der Stern der Weisen. Geschichte oder Legende*. Wien 1969; 2nd ed. 1977.

The subject of Josephus' attitude toward miracles has attracted scholarly attention for a long time. WARBURTON (1985), pp. 423–433, already refutes Spinoza's claim (*Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, chapter 6: *'De Miraculis'*) that Josephus was skeptical toward miracles.

HEINEMANN (1986), comparing Philo, Josephus, and the rabbis on this matter, correctly notes the relative absence in the former two writers of the fantastic wonders prominent in the last; one sees this particularly in Josephus' portrayal of Abraham and Moses, where miracles are cited merely to legitimate them as men of G-d.

GRANT (1987), pp. 183–184, asserts that we cannot determine with certainty whether Josephus accepted or rejected any of the stories of miracles as true since he so frequently uses the techniques of Hellenistic romance. He rightly takes issue with THACKERAY's (1988) statement that Josephus constantly expresses a non-committal attitude toward Biblical miracles; he even notes that in *Antiquities* 10. 260 Josephus heightens the story of the lion's den in Daniel.

BETZ (1989), pp. 132–133, collects and comments on a number of references to wonder-workers in Josephus, notably *War* 2. 259 vs. *Antiquities* 20. 97 and *War* 2. 262 vs. *Antiquities* 20. 170.

DELLING (1990) notes Josephus' belief in the miraculous intervention of G-d as a commonplace in the Hellenistic-Roman world. But, we may comment, Josephus, on the whole, tends to downgrade miracles, as we see especially when we compare, for example, his view of Abraham and Moses as talented generals with the rabbinic portraits of these leaders as prevailing because of G-d's miraculous assistance.

RENGSTORF (1991) (1992) is especially concerned with the distinction between σημεῖον, "sign", and τέρας, "wonder", in Josephus as compared with Philo; he concludes that there is no basic difference, though Josephus' usage is not as broad as Philo's. Josephus, he suggests, intentionally used the term τέρας in

imitation of its employment in Greek epic. In his definition of τέρας as a predictive sign which G-d alone controls, Josephus is very close to the usage of Artapanus.

The most satisfactory treatment of the subject is by MACRAE (1993), who contends that when Josephus says that "everyone is welcome to his own opinion", this is not an indication of skepticism but an expression of courtesy and tolerance intended for his pagan readers, and that a similar formula is found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Indeed, his vocabulary of miracle, notably his use of the word ἐπιφάνεια, is a conscious imitation of Dionysius; but as AVENARIUS (1994), pp. 163–164, shows, the formula to let the reader decide is at least as old as Herodotus (2. 123, 5. 45) and Thucydides (6. 2. 1) and should not be referred specifically to Dionysius. And yet, as MACRAE admits, though this is not the dominant tendency in the 'Antiquities', Josephus does sometimes choose to explain away the wondrous with ingenuity characteristic of a rationalist bent. On the other hand, Josephus sometimes regards miracles as a sign of G-d's providence (πρόνοια). We may comment that in this Josephus is undoubtedly influenced by the Stoics, whose favorite word is πρόνοια and with whom he compares the Pharisees (Life 12). We may add that if there is inconsistency in Josephus' position he is writing as an historian rather than as a theologian: perhaps in the projected work on 'Customs and Causes' he would have resolved the contradictions.

Though MEEKS (1995), p. 139, maintains that Josephus draws a broad contrast between Moses and the magicians, TIEDE (1996) insists that Josephus is trying to show that G-d is responsible for the miracles, although Pharaoh refuses to understand this.

MOEHRING (1997), comparing Josephus with his Biblical sources, concludes that Josephus corrects the Biblical narrative in the light of his understanding of the relationship between G-d and the events on earth. He remarks that when Josephus seems to emphasize the miraculous element, upon clearer analysis this turns out to be rationalization also. As compared with Philo (De Vita Mosis 1. 185–186), Josephus (Ant. 3. 8), in his paraphrase of the events at Marah, goes further and gives a purely rationalistic explanation, the difference in their attitudes being that Philo allegorizes as much as possible, whereas Josephus avoids allegory, though, as we have noted above, this is not always the case.

BETZ (1998) discusses miracles as the historical proof of G-d's power, noting that Josephus does not distinguish miracles from magic as sharply as do the rabbis (a distinction, we may remark, which is hardly as sharp as BETZ would have it, at least in the Babylonian Talmud). BETZ also stresses the historical function of miracle-workers in Josephus as compared with charismatics in rabbinic literature, citing as an example Onias (Ant. 14. 22–24) as against Ḥoni Ha-me'aggal. Again, the miracles in Josephus, as seen notably in his presentation of Exodus 7. 1–13, are strongly influenced by Josephus' own experiences and reflect Josephus' contacts with miracle-workers in his own day.

SPIRO (1999), in a popular article, concludes that Josephus harbored the same doubts and contradictions which other historians of his era held and that in offering both divine and natural causes for events he resembles Tacitus.

COHEN (2000) notes Josephus' inconsistency in omitting a few miracles, such as the pillar of cloud and fire in Exodus 13 and Elijah's translation to heaven, while including others, such as Balaam's talking ass and Jonah and the fish, and concludes that such inconsistencies are characteristic of Josephus' approach to his sources. We may comment that the Septuagint and Targum also are often said to eliminate anthropomorphisms and the like, whereas a close examination of them shows that they are inconsistent and indeed introduce anthropomorphisms in certain places, whence we may conclude, as we may see in the Talmud (Megillah 9a–b), that there were certain traditions as to which passages in the Scriptures might be interpreted more freely.

LEWY (2000a), pp. 154–155, commenting on the parallel between the prodigies in Josephus (War 6. 299) and Tacitus (Histories 5. 13), remarks that Josephus is a noteworthy witness because he happened to be in Jerusalem on Shavuoth, 66, when the 'voice' was heard. The Romans interpreted the *omina* according to their viewpoint.

VAN CANGH (2000b), pp. 317–318, comments on the Biblical narrative concerning bread-miracles in Josephus (Ant. 3. 23–31, 9. 45–94).

FERRARI D'OCCHIEPPO (2000c) comments (p. 40) on the star resembling a sword which was one of the portents of the forthcoming destruction of Jerusalem (War 6. 289) and (pp. 72 ff.) on the eclipse of the moon as Herod's death drew near (Ant. 17. 167).

## 19.26: Josephus' Philosophy of History

- (2001) GEORG BERTRAM: ὕβρις, ὑβριζω, ἐνυβρίζω, ὑβριστής. In: GERHARD KITTEL, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 8. Stuttgart 1969. Pp. 303–304 (English trans., pp. 303–304).
- (2002) WILHELM WEBER: Josephus und Vespasian. Stuttgart 1921.
- (2003) JACK D. SPIRO: Josephus and Colleagues: No Escape from the Mores of the Age. In: Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal 21. 3, Summer 1974, pp. 71–79.
- (2004) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (2004a) OTTO MICHEL: Zum Werdegang und der Geschichtsbetrachtung des Josephus. In: Das Institutum Judaicum der Universität Tübingen 1966–1968. Tübingen 1969 (typewritten). Pp. 12–13.

BERTRAM (2001) presents a survey of the range of meaning and associations of ὕβρις in Josephus. BERTRAM concludes that the importance of ὕβρις lies not merely in the use of the term; rather it is the very key to the author's understanding of history, as WEBER (2002), pp. 24–25, 66–79, had already indicated.

In a popular article, SPIRO (2003) notes that Josephus nowhere states whether he believes in a vertical, horizontal, or cyclical process of history, but concludes that he must have believed in a cyclical view such as was held by other Greek and Roman historians. We may remark that if this were so, Josephus had numerous opportunities to note the repetitiveness of Jewish history but does not do so. For him the chief factor in history is that G-d controls it, rewarding those who obey him and punishing those who do not (Ant. 1. 14). As a Pharisee, we

may add, Josephus looked upon history as a linear process, with a beginning, a climax at Sinai, and an end in the eschatological era.

COHEN (2004) has stressed that for Josephus ἀνάγκη was not mere metaphysical principle but a statement of fact, and that, in contrast to the 'War', which assigns the blame for the war on a small group of mad fanatics, the 'Antiquities' claims that the Jews were compelled by an irresistible concatenation of circumstances. We may comment, however, that in Antiquities 18. 6–9, Josephus clearly places the blame for the war on the Fourth Philosophy for having set in motion the chain of events.

I have not seen MICHEL (2004a).

### 19.27: Josephus' Political Theory

- (2005) KARL L. SCHMIDT: Die Polis in Kirche und Welt; eine lexikographische und exegetische Studie. In: Rektoratsprogramm der Universität Basel für das Jahr 1939.
- (2006) HERMANN STRATHMANN: πόλις in Josephus. In: GERHARD KITTEL, ed., Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 6. Stuttgart 1959. Pp. 526–527 (English trans., pp. 527–529).
- (2007) SAMUEL BELKIN: In His Image: the Jewish Philosophy of Man as Expressed in Rabbinic Tradition. London 1960.
- (2008) MILLARD C. LIND: The Concept of Political Power in Ancient Israel. In: Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 7, 1968–69, pp. 4–24.
- (2009) JÜRGEN C. H. LEBRAM: Der Idealstaat der Juden. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 233–253.
- (2009a) MARCO TREVES: The Reign of G-d in the Old Testament. In: Vetus Testamentum 19, 1969, pp. 230–243.

SCHMIDT (2005), pp. 94–96, discussing Josephus' use of the terms πολιτεία and πολίτευμα, concludes that Josephus does not use the terms in philosophical or eschatological senses but rather in a concrete political sense.

STRATHMANN (2006) asserts that Josephus is a political Hellenist whose use of terms taken from the political sphere is calculated to conceal the religious orientation of the political thought of Israel. He concludes that the main difference between Josephus' political philosophy and that of the Bible is that he suppresses the hope of a new and better Jerusalem which the Bible makes the focal point of its outlook. His time-serving with the Romans, we may note, made the Biblical view politically embarrassing.

BELKIN (2007), pp. 15–18, comments that Josephus' characterization of Judaism by the term theocracy (Against Apion 2. 165), which he coined, is a valid one within the terms of his own definition, that is, that Judaism views the sovereignty of man as dependent upon the sovereignty of G-d.

LIND (2008) explains that it is a misunderstanding to regard theocracy as the rule of G-d mediated through a monarchy or hierarchy, since Josephus contrasts it with a monarchy. It is, he says, the rule of G-d in an immediate sense; but, we may comment, such a view would accord with that of the Fourth

Philosophy with which Josephus violently disagrees. The contrast with monarchies is, we may suggest, with human rulers who regarded themselves as ultimate authorities or even divine.

LEBRAM (2009) shows that in the development of the idea of the ideal state in the second century B.C.E., as found in Strabo 16. 2. 35–37 and Diodorus 40. 3, the Biblical model plays less of a role than the Hellenistic idea. It is this which supplies the background for Josephus' recreation of the time of Moses and of his legislation, as well as of the thought of the militant groups.

TREVES (2009a), pp. 230–231, notes that Josephus (Apion 2. 164–166) contrasts the Jewish theocracy with the monarchic regime. He cites four theocracies in Jewish history down to the destruction of the Temple.

### 19.28: The Chosen People

(2009b) ALBRECHT OEPKE: *Das neue Gottesvolk in Schrifttum, Schauspiel, bildender Kunst und Weltgestaltung*. Gütersloh 1950.

OEPKE (2009b), pp. 129–131, summarizes Josephus' thoughts concerning the Jews as the chosen people. In commenting on Daniel, Josephus does not give the notion of G-d's people, despite his Hellenism.

### 19.29: Josephus' Philosophy of Education

(2009c) H. MUELLER: *A Critical Analysis of the Jewish Educational Philosophy in Relationship to the Epistles of St. Paul*. Steyler 1967.

(2009d) BENEDICT THOMAS VIVIANO: *Study as Worship. Aboth and the New Testament* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 26). Leiden 1978 (Diss., Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 1976).

MUELLER (2009c), pp. 16–23, cites Apion 2. 17–21 on Josephus' philosophy of education. Josephus makes clear that education was not idealized for its own sake among the Greeks. Torah for its own sake meant the practice of religious obligations without regard to material gains.

VIVIANO (2009d), pp. 153–157, notes that the mention in Apion 2. 170–178 of the four cardinal virtues links this passage with Philo (*De Vita Mosi* 2. 215–216) and suggests that this point was a commonplace of Hellenistic Jewish religious propaganda, not without a basis in fact. From Josephus, says VIVIANO, it is clear that the ideal of education found in the Mishnaic tractate 'Avoth' was not wholly new, and that indeed it existed in all branches of Judaism, except perhaps among the Sadducees.

### 19.30: Josephus' Attitude toward the Land of Israel

(2010) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed.: *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities* (in Hebrew). Vol. 1, Jerusalem 1944.



- (2011) YEḤEZKEL KAUFMANN: *Golah ve-Nekhar* (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Tel-Aviv 1929.
- (2012) AZRIEL SHOCHAT: *The Views of Josephus on the Future of Israel and Its Land* (in Hebrew). In: *Yerushalayim* (review for Erez-Israel research dedicated to Isaias Press), Jerusalem 1953, pp. 43–50.
- (2012a) DAVID SOLOMON: *Reciprocal Spiritual and Cultural Influences between Diaspora and Eretz Israel Jewry during the Second Temple Era and until the Revolt under Trajan* (in Hebrew, with English summary). Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1979.

SCHALIT (2010), p. lxxxi, concludes that Josephus gave up on the land of Israel after the abortive revolution of 66–74 and saw the future of the Jews as being in the West. If, indeed, as KAUFMANN (2011), p. 297, claims, Josephus gave up the traditional Messianic hope in complete silence so that he even ascribed Messianic prophecy to Vespasian, it would follow that he would no longer see the land of Israel as central in the future of the Jewish people; but, we may reply, it would be hard to believe that one could openly proclaim himself a Pharisee, as Josephus did (Life 12), without believing in a doctrine so central to the Pharisees, the belief in a Messiah.

SHOCHAT (2012) rightly disagrees with SCHALIT and KAUFMANN and notes that Josephus sees the Diaspora as a punishment, as is clear from Azariah's prophecy that warned the Jews that if they abandoned their worship of G-d (Ant. 8. 296–297), He as a punishment would scatter them over the face of the earth so that they would lead a life as aliens and wanderers. That there is no hint in Josephus of the traditional Jewish hope that the Jews would some day be gathered together from the exile and return to the land of Israel may be due to the fact that Josephus was sensitive to the charge that the Jews were a nation within a nation who would forever be subversive until their return from captivity.

I have not seen SOLOMON (2012a). [See *infra*, p. 942.]

### 19.31: Resurrection

- (2012b) KURT SCHUBERT: *Die jüdischen Religionsparteien im Zeitalter Jesu*. In: KURT SCHUBERT, ed., *Der historische Jesus und der Christus unseres Glaubens, eine katholische Auseinandersetzung mit den Folgen der Entmythologisierungstheorie*. Im Auftrag des Katholischen Akademikerverbandes der Erzdiözese Wien. Wien 1962. Pp. 15–101.
- (2012c) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: *The Sages. Their Concepts and Beliefs*. 2 vols. Jerusalem 1975.

SCHUBERT (2012b), pp. 70–71, citing parallel rabbinic passages, argues that Josephus (War 2. 163) is not talking about the transmigration of souls but about immortality and resurrection.

URBACH (2012c), p. 653, comments on the belief in immortality of the soul and resurrection of the body among the Pharisees and Essenes according to Josephus.

## 19.32: The Messiah and Eschatology in General

- (2013) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: Die Messianischen Vorstellungen des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten. Diss., Heidelberg 1902. Publ.: Krakau 1903. Hebrew version: The Messianic Idea in Israel. Tel-Aviv 1949–50. Trans. from 3rd Hebrew ed. into English by WILLIAM F. STINESPRING: The Messianic Idea in Israel from Its Beginning to the Completion of the Mishnah. New York 1955.
- (2014) CULLEN I. K. STORY: What Kind of Messiah Did the Jews Expect? In: Bibliotheca Sacra (Dallas) 104, 1947, pp. 483–494; 105, 1948, pp. 102–114, 233–247.
- (2015) SIGMUND O. P. MOWINCKEL: Han som Kommer. Copenhagen 1951. Trans. into English by GEORGE W. ANDERSON: He That Cometh. Oxford 1956.
- (2016) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity. London 1951; 2nd ed., 1957.
- (2017) ROBERT EISLER: IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (2018) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Essenes and Messianic Expectations: A Historical Study of the Sects and Ideas during the Second Jewish Commonwealth. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 45, 1954–55, pp. 83–119.
- (2019) ALAN LETTOFSKY: The War of the Jews against the Romans according to Josephus and the Talmudic Sources (in Hebrew). Senior Honors Paper, Brandeis University Library, Waltham, Mass. 1959.
- (2020) JOSEPH BLENKINSOPP: Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus. In: Journal of Jewish Studies 25, 1974, pp. 239–262.
- (2021) WALTER CAHN: An Illustrated Josephus from the Meuse Region in Merton College, Oxford. In: Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte 29, 1966, pp. 295–310.
- (2022) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY: La mort d'Éléazar fils de Jaïre et les courants apologétiques dans le *De Bello Judaico* de Flavius Josèphe. In: Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer. Paris 1971. Pp. 461–490.
- (2022a) THOMAS FRANCIS GLASSON: Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology. With Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs. London 1961.
- (2022b) C. D. PEDDINGHAUS: Die Entstehung der Leidensgeschichte. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche und historische Untersuchung des Werdens und Wachsens der erzählenden Passionstradition bis zum Entwurf des Marcus. Diss., Heidelberg 1965.
- (2022c) J. C. O'NEILL: The Silence of Jesus. In: New Testament Studies 15, 1968–69, pp. 153–167.
- (2022d) ELLIS RIVKIN: Prolegomenon to rpt. of WILLIAM O. E. OESTERLY, ed., Judaism and Christianity, I: The Age of Transition. London 1937; rpt. New York 1969. Pp. ix–lxx.
- (2022e) ELEMÉR KOCIS: Apokalyptik und politisches Interesse im Spätjudentum. In: Judaica 27, 1971, pp. 71–89.
- (2022f) JEHOSSUA AMIR (formerly HERMANN NEUMARK): Die messianische Idee im hellenistischen Judentum. In: Freiburger Rundbrief 25, 1973, pp. 195–203. Originally in Hebrew in Maḥanayim 124, 1970, pp. 54–67.
- (2022g) FERDINAND DEXINGER: Ein 'Messianisches Szenarium' als Gemeingut des Judentums in nachherodianischer Zeit? In: Kairos 17, 1975, pp. 249–278.
- (2022h) MARCEL SIMON: Jupiter-Yahvé. Sur un essai de théologie pagano-juive. In: Numen 23, 1976, pp. 40–66.
- (2022i) ULRICH FISCHER: Eschatologie und Jenseitserwartung im hellenistischen Diasporajudentum (Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, 44). Berlin 1978. Originally diss., Heidelberg 1977: Studien zur Eschatologie des hellenistischen Diasporajudentums.
- (2022j) MORTON SMITH: Messiahs, Robbers, Jurists, Prophets, and Magicians. In: Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research 44, 1977, pp. 185–195.

- (2022k) PIERRE GRELOT: *L'Espérance juive à l'Heure de Jésus* (Collection 'Jésus et Jésus-Christ', 6). Paris 1978.
- (2022l) LARS HARTMANN: The Functions of Some So-Called Apocalyptic Timetables. In: *New Testament Studies* 22, 1976, pp. 1–14.
- (2022m) GEORGE W. BUCHANAN: *Revolution and Redemption. Jewish Documents of Deliverance from the Fall of Jerusalem to the Death of Nahmanides*. Introduction, Translation, Conclusions, and Notes. Dillsboro, North Carolina 1978.

KLAUSNER (2013) has a general survey of the many kinds of Messiah mentioned in Jewish literature.

STORY (2014), in a popular survey, comments on the general Messianic expectancy among Jews and the reasons for this, and, in particular, on various false Messiahs, notably Theudas (Ant. 20. 97–98), who, he says, is not to be identified with Theudas of Acts 5. 36; but, as we note below, the name Theudas is relatively uncommon.

MOWINCKEL (2015), pp. 284–285, cites Josephus as evidence that Messianic expectation was widely diffused during this period, that there were many claimants, and that the conception was of a political, this-worldly nature.

BRANDON (2016) revives the theories of EISLER (2017) that Jesus was a political messiah and that Josephus regarded him as such. That, indeed, we may comment, Josephus thought of the Messiah as a political figure seems likely, not merely because of the prophecy that from Judaea would come a ruler of the world (War 6. 310–315) but also because in Josephus' day this was the prevailing view, as we see notably in the great Rabbi Akiva's recognition of Bar Kochba as the Messiah in the revolt of 132. But it is precisely because of this that Josephus is opposed to the various charismatic figures who claimed to be Messiahs, since the Romans would look upon such leaders as revolutionaries, as indeed they did look upon Jesus. If Josephus, indeed, wrote the passage calling Jesus 'Messiah', we may wonder why he is so complimentary to him.

ZEITLIN (2018) remarks that in the works of neither Philo nor Josephus is there any mention of a Messiah or of Messianic expectations (ZEITLIN does not accept as genuine the statement in Antiquities 18. 63 that Jesus was the Messiah), and that this omission was not due to fear of his benefactors, the Flavians, but rather to the fact that he did not share this belief.

LETOFSKY (2019) contrasts the Rabbinic belief in Messianic redemption in the distant future with Josephus' belief, as expressed in the speech of Agrippa II (War 2. 390), that G-d had forsaken His people and had gone over to the Romans; but we may comment that what Agrippa is saying, as Augustine was to say later in the 'City of G-d', is that the Romans could never have built up their empire without G-d's aid.

Most recently BLENKINSOPP (2020) remarks on the fact that there is no mention of eschatology in Josephus. For Josephus, he concludes, the kingdom is already here in the theocracy which is Judaism and in the observance of the laws; all that is left is the reward of a life after death. We may comment that while it is true that in the Middle Ages for such a writer as the thirteenth-century Nachmanides the concept of the Messiah is of secondary importance, yet in Josephus' time, when the belief in a Messiah was so

widespread among all factions of Jews, except the despised and small minority of Sadducees, it is hard to believe that Josephus had abandoned such a view, though admittedly this is possible, since in the fourth century we hear (Sanhedrin 98b–99a) that Hillel II denied that the Messiah would ever come (and is rebuked for this).

CAHN (2021) attempts to see Messianic implications in Josephus' account of the intended sacrifice of Isaac, who, in an extra-Biblical addition, declares his willingness to die at G-d's command (Ant. 1. 232). Athanasius (Homiliae Paschales 6. 8) notes that the idea of Isaac's readiness to offer to life to save the Jewish people was current in Jewish circles (we may cite Shabbath 89 b), thus foreshadowing the parallel between Isaac and Jesus. We may note that IV Maccabees (1. 11, 17, 19–23, 18. 24) expounds the view that the suffering of the righteous martyr is an expiation for the sins of the community. CAHN also sees a Messianic allusion in Josephus' account of the presentation of Moses to Pharaoh, who places his crown upon Moses' head only to have Moses cast it to the ground (Ant. 2. 233), whereupon Pharaoh's advisers recognized in Moses the savior of the Jews. Cahn sees in this narrative a parallel to Matthew's account (2. 1–16) of Herod's search for Jesus, who, he had heard, would be king of the Jews. We may comment that in Josephus the sacred scribe (Ant. 2. 234) who warns Pharaoh does not indicate that this was to be a savior Messiah but only one who would overthrow his empire.

NIKIPROWETZKY (2022) argues that there are esoteric references in the 'War' to Messianism indicating Josephus' belief that the Roman power was destined to be broken by a messianic kingdom; but, we may comment, such a view, even if implied, would have been dangerous; and, in fact, Josephus suppresses the messianic ideals of the revolutionaries in the war against Rome, though he disavows association with them, so much did he apparently fear Roman wrath. Only when he wrote the 'Antiquities' many years later did he dare to hint cryptically (Ant. 10. 276), though the text is in doubt, that the Roman empire would be overthrown.

GLASSON (2022a), pp. 48–56, concludes that it is a mistake to restrict Greek influence to the Judaism of the Diaspora and to the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Josephus' inconsistency in eschatology perhaps, he says, corresponds to a genuine indecision in Pharisaic circles. We may, however, comment that there is, to be sure, indecision of verdict, but that every Pharisee had a particular view regarding punishment and reward after death.

PEDDINGHAUS (2022b), pp. 66–79, discusses Josephus' view in his chapter on 'Messianic and prophetic expectations'.

O'NEILL (2022c) remarks that most Jews at the time would understand that the Messiah would not be able to claim Messiahship for himself but had to wait for G-d to enthrone him. Hence, Jesus' silence is part of his messianic role. Josephus, say O'NEILL, lists ten leaders who gathered followings and might have been considered Messiahs by adherents looking for the Messiah: Judas son of Ezekias (Ant. 17. 271–272), Simon ex-slave of Herod (Ant. 17. 273–276), Athronges the shepherd (Ant. 17. 278–284), Menahem the Galilean (War 2. 433ff.), Simon bar Giora (War 4. 503ff.), Theudas (Ant. 20. 47ff.), the Egyptian

who led thirty thousand to the Mount of Olives (Ant. 20. 167–171, War 2. 261–263), Jonathan of Cyrene (War 7. 437–438), Jesus son of Ananus (War 6. 300–301), and the Samaritan who promised to show the sacred vessels of Moses (Ant. 18. 85–89). It is striking that none of these calls himself a Messiah. We may comment that none of them is termed a Messiah by Josephus, but that this does not mean that none termed himself a Messiah, since Josephus as a super-patriot could not tolerate a Messiah, that is, a political rebel against Rome. Alternatively, we may suggest that perhaps Josephus did not believe in a personal Messiah, though it is hard to believe that Josephus, as a practicing Pharisee (Life 12) did not have such a belief, just as Philo speaks only of a messianic age (*De Praemiis et Poenis* 28–29, 91 ff., 165, 171; *De Vita Mosi* 2. 44, 51, 288) and not of a personal Messiah. There was, apparently, a great divergence of views concerning the nature of the Messiah, as the Talmud indicates, though Josephus' failure to mention a personal Messiah (unless we accept as authentic the personal Messiah in *Antiquities* 18. 63) is striking. This may have been conditioned by his grave attitude toward the Romans, who were, of course, negatively disposed toward every political leader who advocated Jewish independence.

RIVKIN (2022d), pp. xlv–xlv, on the basis of Josephus, concludes that neither the Pharisees nor the majority of the Jews were expecting the Messiah. We may, however, respond that Josephus' omission of the mention of a Messiah may well be due to his groveling to please his Roman patrons, who would certainly have disapproved of a view that looked to the coming of a political liberator from foreign domination.

KOCIS (2022e), pp. 73–74, notes that Josephus (Ant. 17. 32 ff.) speaks of a conspiracy at the court of Herod, since the wife of Pheroras, Herod's youngest brother, was under the influence of the Pharisees, who spoke, though not explicitly, of the imminent arrival of the Messiah. The statement that a certain Bagoas would be the father (*grandvizier*) "of him who would some day be set over the people with the title of king, for all the power would belong to him," shows, says KOCIS, that the Pharisees expected the imminent coming of the Messiah. KOCIS, pp. 81–82, also comments on the prophecy (War 3. 399–408) that Vespasian would be ruler of the world. Josephus (War 6. 313) also refers to Vespasian a prediction that he would rule the world. This, says KOCIS, is a malicious falsification of Daniel. Josephus, however, made a proletariat career out of this secular apocalyptic and perverted Messianism.

AMIR (2022f) comments on Josephus' negative attitude toward Messianism and the reasons behind it.

DEXINGER (2022g), pp. 255–266, briefly surveys Messianic expectations in Philo (*De Praemiis et Poenis*) and in Josephus, and of Messianic movements reported by Josephus. He notes that among the common denominators in post-Herodian messianism are the guilt of Israel, the leadership of a single person, the journey into the wilderness as a prelude, and, most significantly, the prediction of the destruction of the Temple. Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem and his criticism of the Temple should be viewed against this backdrop. DEXINGER focusses, especially in regard to Josephus, on his reserve on political grounds, and on his

negative attitude toward eschatology and toward messianic thinking. Philo was similarly disturbed by messianism.

SIMON (2022h), commenting on the identification of Vespasian as the Messiah, concludes that Josephus' attitude is not very different from Johanan ben Zakkai. We may comment that a distinction must be made between the prediction that Vespasian would be emperor and the awaiting of a Messiah, who must be Jewish, must gather in all Jewish exiles to Jerusalem, and must bring about a truly independent Jewish state and a reign of peace, etc.

FISCHER (2022i) summarizes the general lack of eschatological expectations in Hellenistic Jewish literature in contrast to the eschatology so prominent in II Enoch, III Baruch, and IV Maccabees, as well as in 'Joseph and Asenath'. He comments on the problem of national eschatology in Philo and Josephus and concludes (pp. 144–156) that in the Diaspora belief in an individual life after death was more important than apocalyptic or cosmological ideas, that there was no single view of an individual afterlife, and that there is no indication that the end was near. He comments, in particular, on eschatological references in the oration at Jotapata (War 3. 362–382), on Essene eschatology (War 2. 154–158), and on Pharisaic eschatology (War 2. 163). He notes that, according to Josephus, at the moment of death the immortal soul was separated from the perishable body and that the good souls went to heaven, while the evil ones went to Hades. He says that there was a closer identification of Josephus' own opinions with apocalyptic speculations in his earlier life, especially before the war turned against the Jews.

SMITH (2022j) discusses the careers of four typical messianic figures – a robber, a teacher, a prophet, and a magician – as described in the New Testament and in Josephus. He contends that in each case the meaning of the term Messiah was changed to accommodate the different careers. Each rose to prominence for more practical reasons but then took advantage of existing messianic expectations. He notes that the exorcist (Ant. 8. 46) who worked with an inscribed ring was apparently not involved in politics, but that we can easily imagine a man with remarkable gifts of this sort attracting large crowds and becoming the center of speculation as to whether he was the Messiah. We may comment that Josephus says nothing of such speculation here or anywhere else as being aroused by feats of magic; and rabbinic sources are in almost total agreement that the prime requisite of the Messiah is political power. In any case, Josephus does know the word *χριστός*, that is "Messiah" (Ant. 18. 63 and 20. 200), despite his objections to political rebels against Rome; and thus the burden of proof rests on those who assert that there are hidden allusions to messiahs elsewhere in Josephus.

GRELOT (2022k) comments on the revolt of Athronges (Ant. 17. 278–281), the messiah-like pretender to the throne. In general, he is interested in clarifying the Gospel accounts, where one sees manifest the popular beliefs at the time of Jesus. His work contains an anthology of texts, including Josephus, briefly annotated, embracing speculations concerning the Messiah and the end of the world.

HARTMANN (2022l) remarks that Josephus was reluctant when it came to expecting concrete extraordinary actions of divine salvation in the present.

Josephus' non-eschatological understanding allowed in principle for prediction of historical rulers and dates, although a special gift was needed for a correct understanding.

BUCHANAN (2022m) has an anthology of texts pertaining to redemption, preceded by an introduction and followed by a conclusion in which he attempts to see the eschatology of the New Testament against this setting.

### 19.33: The Messianic Background of the Jewish Revolt

- (2023) YEHEZKEL KAUFMANN: *Golah ve-Nekhar* (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Tel-Aviv 1929.
- (2024) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: *Prolegomena*. In: VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER and ALEXANDER FUKS, edd., *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, Mass. 1957. Pp. 1–111.
- (2025) AUGUST STROBEL: *Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49, 1958, pp. 157–196.
- (2026) JACOB LIVER: *The House of David from the Fall of the Kingdom of Judah to the Fall of the Second Commonwealth and After* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1959 (originally diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem).
- (2027) WILLIAM L. LANE: *Times of Refreshment: A Study of Eschatological Periodization in Judaism and Christianity*. Diss., Th. D., Harvard University Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. 1962.
- (2028) OTTO MICHEL: *Studien zu Josephus. Simon bar Giora*. In: *New Testament Studies* 14, 1967–68, pp. 402–408.
- (2029) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Josephus Flavius*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (2030) MARIANUS DE JONGE: *χρίω, χριστός, ἀντίχριστος, χρίσμα, χριστιανός*: Philo and Josephus. In: GERHARD KITTEL, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 9. Stuttgart 1973. Pp. 511–512 (pp. 520–521 in English trans.).
- (2031) MARIANUS DE JONGE: *Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 205–219.
- (2032) OTTO BÖCHER: *Die heilige Stadt im Völkerkrieg: Wandlungen eines apokalyptischen Schemas*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 55–76.

A number of scholars, such as KAUFMANN (2023), p. 297, have noted the silence with which Josephus passes over Messianic beliefs as a background for the Jewish revolt against the Romans. Inasmuch as the Messianic background of the Bar Kochba rebellion of 132–135 is well authenticated, and since a Messianic background for the rebellion of Loukuas-Andreas against Trajan (115–117) is very likely, as TCHERIKOVER (2024), pp. 89–93, has demonstrated, it seems most likely that the Messianic prophecy which Josephus (and Johanan ben Zakkai) applied to Vespasian and which is reported by Suetonius and Tacitus, as noted above, most probably was applied by the revolutionaries to the Messiah.

STROBEL (2025) stresses that Eleazar, in emphasizing the immortality of the soul, was proclaiming the nearness of the advent of the Messiah; but, we may

comment, the concept of the immortality of the soul in Greek thought, notably in Plato, which Josephus allows to pervade Eleazar's speeches, has no such association.

LIVER (2026), pp. 162–170 in his dissertation, pp. 141–147 in his book, in his general survey of Messianic expectations from the beginning of Roman domination to the time of the Bar Kochba revolt, fails to realize the Messianic significance of the revolt of 66–74.

LANE (2027), pp. 283–284, notes that Josephus' account of pseudo-Messiahs in 'Antiquities', Book 20, is complemented by rabbinic material. Thus Josephus presents Eleazar ben Dinai and Amram as mere revolutionaries, whereas the rabbis (Midrash Song of Songs Rabbah 2. 18) note their messianic pretensions. LANE notes the Messianic dimension of the Great Revolt against the Romans, calling attention to the fact that Menahem the leader of the Sicarii (War 2. 434) is described as returning to Jerusalem "like a veritable king" and as having been murdered while wearing royal robes (War 2. 444). Such a description is appropriate for a leader with Messianic pretensions; and, indeed, in rabbinic literature he is designated Menahem ben Hezekiah (perhaps in allusion to his Messianic aspirations, since Hezekiah was regarded by some as having been destined to be the Messiah [Sanhedrin 94a]).

MICHEL (2028) notes that the Messianic aspect of the apocalyptic revolutionary leader Simon bar Giora is obscured but not totally eliminated in Josephus. This Messianic aspect, as LANE (2027) remarks, is supported by his coins.

SCHALIT (2029) suggests that Josephus' silence regarding the role of Messianism in arousing the Jewish masses to war was intended to represent the war as an action of the fanatical foreign element in order to exculpate the Jews as a whole in the eyes of the Roman administration. SCHALIT suggests that Josephus was silent in order to conceal the Jewish hostility to the Romans, a hostility which, we may note, is apparent in the Talmud.

DE JONGE (2030) comments on the significance of the fact that Josephus does not describe as messiahs any of the many Messianic prophets who appeared in Palestine during the first century. He concludes that for Josephus Vespasian is the central figure in his Biblically-inspired expectation for the future: it was this hope and the fact that he detested the Zealots that made it impossible for Josephus to evaluate fairly the expectations of his contemporaries. We may comment that Josephus, as a good Pharisaic Jew, could hardly have ascribed Messianic status to Vespasian, inasmuch as the Messiah was generally regarded as the son of David.

DE JONGE (2031) concludes that Josephus did not give the oracle in War 6. 312 a messianic interpretation and that he did not regard Vespasian as a messianic figure. He suggests the identification of Menahem as the Messiah (War 2. 444–448) or the possibility of a belief in Messianism without a belief in a personal Messiah.

BÖCHER (2032) compares the eschatological role of Jerusalem in Josephus with that in the Bible, IV Esdras, the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, and the New Testament. He notes the especially close relationship with the Apocalypse



of Baruch in looking upon the Romans as present-day servants of the G-d of judgment.

### 19.34: Josephus' Attitude toward Women

(2032a) EVELYN and FRANK STAGG: *Woman in the World of Jesus*. Philadelphia 1978.

STAGG and STAGG (2032a), pp. 45–48, conclude that Josephus is definitely biased against women, though less so than others in this period.

## 20: Josephus' Views on Halakhah (Jewish Law)

### 20.0: Josephus' Attitude toward Halakhah (Jewish Law): General

- (2033) JOHN SELDEN: *De synedriis et praefecturis juridicis veterum Ebraeorum libri tres*. London 1650–55.
- (2034) MARCUS OLITZKI: Flavius Josephus und die Halacha: I. Einleitung, die Opfer (Diss. Leipzig). Berlin 1885. II. Die Einkünfte der Leviten und Priester. In: *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 16, 1889, pp. 169–182. Rituelle und judicielle Fälle bei Flavius Josephus. In: *Israelitische Monatsschrift* 1887, no. 3, pp. 3–4; no. 4, p. 14; no. 7, pp. 26–27. Der jüdische Sklave nach Josephus und der Halacha. In: *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums* 16, 1889, pp. 73–83.
- (2035) HEINRICH WEYL: *Die jüdischen Strafgesetze bei Flavius Josephus in ihrem Verhältnis zu Schrift und Halacha* (Mit einer Einleitung: Flavius Josephus über die jüdischen Gerichtshöfe und Richter). Berlin 1900.
- (2036) HEINRICH GUTTMANN: *Die Darstellung der jüdischen Religion bei Flavius Josephus*. Breslau 1928.
- (2037) AHARON KAMINKA: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (2038) BERNARD REVEL: Some Anti-Traditional Laws of Josephus. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 14, 1923–24, pp. 293–301.
- (2039) ISAAK HEINEMANN: Die Allegoristik der hellenistischen Juden außer Philon. In: *Mnemosyne* 5, 1952, pp. 130–138.
- (2040) SUZANNE DANIEL: La Halacha de Philon selon le Premier Livre des Lois Spéciales. In: ROGER ARNALDEZ, CLAUDE MONDÉSERT, JEAN POUILLOUX, edd., *Colloques Nationaux du Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique: Philon d'Alexandrie*: Lyon 11–15 Septembre 1966. Paris 1967. Pp. 221–241.
- (2041) STEVEN RISKIN: The Halakhah in Josephus as Reflected in *Against Apion* and *The Life*. Diss., M. A., Yeshiva University, New York 1970, 83 pp.
- (2042) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. New York 1953–68.
- (2043) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: The Orthodoxy of the Jews in Hellenistic Egypt. In: *Jewish Social Studies* 22, 1960, pp. 215–237.
- (2044) SAMUEL BELKIN: Philo and the Oral Law: The Philonic Interpretation of Biblical Law in Relation to the Palestinian Halakah (Harvard Semitic Series, 11). Cambridge, Mass. 1940.
- (2045) GEORGE F. MOORE: *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: the Age of the Tannaim*. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass. 1927–30.
- (2046) SAMUEL BELKIN: The Alexandrian Source for Contra Apionem II. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 27, 1936–37, pp. 1–32. Rpt. in expanded form: *The Alexandrian Halakah in Apologetic Literature of the First Century C.E.* Philadelphia 1936.
- (2047) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (2048) DAVID ALTSHULER: *Descriptions in Josephus' Antiquities of the Mosaic Constitution*. Diss., Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1976.

- (2048a) CHANOKH ALBECK: *Das Buch der Jubiläen und die Halacha*. Berlin 1930.
- (2048b) HARRY O. H. LEVINE: *Halakah in Josephus: Public and Criminal Law*. Diss., Dropsie College, Philadelphia 1935.
- (2048c) RAMON SUGRANYES DE FRANCH: *Études sur le droit palestinien à l'époque évangélique. La contrainte par corps*. Fribourg 1946.
- (2048d) ISAAC H. HERZOG: *Something on Josephus* (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 14 (vol. 25), 1949, pp. 8–11.
- (2048e) GERHARD PFEIFER: *Ursprung und Wesen der Hypostasenvorstellungen im Judentum*. Diss. Jena (*Arbeiten zur Theologie*, I. Reihe, Hft. 31). Stuttgart 1967.
- (2048f) ZE'EV W. FALK: *Introduction to Jewish Law of the Second Commonwealth* (in Hebrew). 2 vols. Tel-Aviv 1969–71. Trans. into English. Part 1: Leiden 1972; Part 2: 1978.
- (2048g) BERNARD S. JACKSON: *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History* (*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 10, ed. JACOB NEUSNER). Leiden 1975.
- (2048h) LAWRENCE H. SCHIFFMAN: *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Diss., 2 vols., Brandeis Univ., Waltham, Mass. 1974. Publ. (*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 16): Leiden 1975.
- (2048i) DAVID GOLDENBERG: *The Halakha in Josephus and in Tannaitic Literature: A Comparative Study*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 67, 1976, pp. 30–43.
- (2048j) DAVID GOLDENBERG: *The Halakhah in Josephus and in Tannaitic Literature: A Comparative Study*. Diss., Dropsie Univ., Philadelphia 1978.
- (2048k) JAKOB NAHUM EPSTEIN: *Introduction to Tannaitic Literature: Mishna, Tosephta and Halakhic Midrashim* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1957. Ed. EZRA Z. MELAMED.
- (2048l) YITZHAK D. GILAT: *The Halakhot of R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanos* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1965. 2nd ed.: *The Teachings of R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanos and their Position in the History of the Halakha*. Tel-Aviv 1968.
- (2048m) JAMES E. CROUCH: *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel* (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, 109). Göttingen 1972.
- (2048n) MENAHEM ELON: *Jewish Law: History, Sources, Principles* (in Hebrew). 3 vols. Jerusalem 1973; 2nd ed., 2 vols. Jerusalem 1978.
- (2048o) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, trans.: *Josephus, Antiquitates Iudaicae* (in Hebrew). Vol. 2. Jerusalem 1944.

Josephus writes (Ant. 4. 196): “All is here written [regarding the laws] as he [Moses] left it: nothing have we added for the sake of embellishment, nothing which has not been bequeathed by Moses.” Josephus declares (Ant. 4. 197) that his only innovation has been to classify the laws. “I have thought it necessary,” he concludes, “to make this preliminary observation, lest perchance any of my countrymen who read this work should reproach me at all for having gone astray.”

SELDEN (2033), pp. 1106–1107, already remarks that whether purposely or from ignorance Josephus sometimes notably diverges from the law as understood by the rabbis.

OLITZI (2034), who began but did not complete a systematic investigation of Josephus' halakhah, notices numerous instances where Josephus betrayed an ignorance of Jewish law.

WEYL (2035) and GUTTMANN (2036) remark that we must not be misled into thinking that because Josephus was a priest he was an expert in religious law.

KAMINKA (2037), pp. 57–66, in explaining these discrepancies, states simply that Josephus, despite what he tells us about his education, was not learned in his explanations of the Torah; but his deviations, we may comment, are not usually matters of learning but of mere fact.

REVEL (2038) adds that because Josephus had been away for about a quarter of a century from Palestine, his originally meager knowledge of law was even more depleted, especially since the oral law had not yet been committed to writing. But, we may comment, as REVEL himself admits, the fact that, in a treatise on Jewish law which entailed and indeed attempts a kind of codification of halakhah, Josephus omits certain laws (Exodus 21. 7–11, 20–22, 26–27, Leviticus 1. 4, 3. 2) is an indication that his work is deliberate, often motivated by apologetic concerns. We may add that the fact that Josephus in a number of places, notably at the very end of the 'Antiquities' (20. 268), refers to a projected work on the laws, presumably even more extensive than his treatment in 'Antiquities', Books 3 and 4, is evidence that he considered himself qualified to write such a treatise.

HEINEMANN (2039) takes seriously Josephus' statement (Ant. 1. 23–24) that everything in the Torah corresponds to nature and does not require allegorizing for its defense, since he permits his readers (Ant. 3. 81) to believe or not to believe what is written there. He concludes that Josephus does not show the slightest inclination to give up the commandments. We must, however, comment that there is a distinction between the miraculous elements in the Biblical narrative, where indeed Josephus sometimes accords his readers latitude to believe or not to believe, and the commandments, where Josephus does not grant such a choice to his readers. It is precisely in the latter category that we do find a number of instances where Josephus does depart from the Judaism that we know from the contemporary rabbis.

DANIEL (2040) in general notes the agreement among Philo, Josephus, and the Palestinian Halakhah; but, we may reply, while it is true that in the great majority of instances there is a correspondence, it is precisely the fact that there are a number of divergences that gives rise to the question as to the state of Halakhah in their time.

RISKIN (2041) briefly but systematically compares the Halakah as found in 'Against Apion' and the Life with the rabbinic sources. Unfortunately he generally omits the 'Antiquities', where, in Books 3 and 4, Josephus has a more extensive exposition of the laws. Not surprisingly, in view of the widespread influence of the Pharisaic rabbis that Josephus himself notes (Ant. 18. 15), he concludes that Josephus corroborates the Oral Law of the rabbis in twelve instances and that in eleven other instances he accords with an oral tradition which was not necessarily accepted as final and authoritative. Where Josephus departs from the rabbinic tradition, as for example in forbidding Jews to blaspheme the gods of Gentiles, RISKIN contends, this is because Josephus is writing for external consumption; and, we may add, Josephus here had rabbinic precedent in the changes that they authorized (Megillah 9 a) in the translation of the Septuagint. Other instances of apparent divergences RISKIN explains by

saying that Josephus sometimes confuses counsel with law and thus occasionally exaggerates the penalty.

But, we may comment, all such attempts to explain away Josephus' divergences from the rabbinic code fail to give sufficient weight to the artistic evidence compiled by GOODENOUGH (2042), the evidence of papyri and inscriptions in Egypt which I (2043) have discussed, and the evidence from Philo, which even BELKIN (2044), with all his ingenuity, must admit disagrees in a number of instances from rabbinic law. The picture, we may suggest, that emerges is of a Judaism that is not as monolithic or as normative as MOORE (2045) described, but rather a religion where the authority of the rabbis was not as pervasive as we have been led to believe by such writers as Josephus (Ant. 18. 15).

In some instances, according to BELKIN (2046), Josephus was led to his deviations by his use of Philo's 'Hypothetica'. But, as RISKIN (2041), p. 49, well notes, there are only four instances in which the 'Hypothetica' (so far as it is extant, we must add) may have served as a source for non-traditional laws in 'Against Apion', namely the death penalty for abortion, the prohibition of revealing secrets, the necessity of kindness toward suppliant animals, and public reading of the Torah on the Sabbath. The first three have their parallels in rabbinic sources, if not quite as precise as in Philo, and the fourth may simply reflect, as RISKIN suggests, the prevailing practice. We may comment that Josephus, who was under constant attack from his fellow Jews, would hardly have dared such 'deviations' from Jewish law unless he had solid ground on which to rest his interpretations; hence, even if he did use Philo, he would have adopted only those portions consonant with the practice among pious Jews in his homeland.

SCHALIT (2047) concludes that Josephus' disagreements with Halakhah reflect not ignorance but rather a Halakhic tradition that is no longer extant either because it was rejected or because it was forgotten in the course of time. The debates in the Talmud, we may comment, sometimes indicate, as we shall see, minority positions which we discover in Philo and/or Josephus, and often allude to lost interpretations which later rabbis try to reconstruct.

ALTSHULER (2048) in his dissertation presents a paragraph-by-paragraph commentary on Antiquities 3. 224–286, 4. 67–75, 4. 199–301, comparing the content and form of Josephus' laws with those found in the Hebrew and Greek Bibles. [See *infra*, p. 943.]

ALBECK (2048a), pp. 3, 54, and 57–58, cautions against the unconditional use of Philo and of Josephus in studying the history of halakhah, since they were writing for a non-Jewish audience and sought to amalgamate Judaism with Greek points of view.

LEVINE (2048b) is generally content merely to cite rabbinic parallels without further discussion. Where there are differences he sometimes seeks strenuously to reconcile them, whereas at other times he makes no attempt to explain them at all. He concludes, p. 81, from the fact that Josephus (Ant. 4. 202) uses the term *βλασφημίας*, which is not in the Septuagint, that Josephus was dependent upon rabbinic sources rather than upon the Bible or its versions.

LEVINE notes that in a number of instances Josephus states a law without giving its conditions. We may comment that the reason for this is that Josephus is not presenting a handbook of Halakhah.

SUGRANYES DE FRANCH (2048c), pp. 82–83, remarks that Josephus' false interpretation of the facts signifies rather that it is from his time that the law was comprised such as he presents it. Josephus knew only the state of the law which he had before his eyes and for the ancient epoch: his only source is the Bible. We may comment, however, that Josephus knew the Oral Law surely of his own time, as his reinterpretations of Halakhah show.

HERZOG (2048d), a great Talmudist, concludes that Josephus was not great in Halakhah or in Aggadah, and that he even presents a wrong view, for example, in his statement of the punishment of adultery and rape.

PFEIFER (2048e) notes that  $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\eta$  is autonomous (War 5. 27, 5. 34; Ant. 6. 305, 13. 294), and that Law is similarly depicted (Ant. 3. 274, 3.321). Law is indeed eternal, and is evidence of G-d (Ant. 4. 319). This is the beginning of his hypostasizing.

FALK (2048f) constantly co-ordinates Josephus with the Talmud and papyri on the growth of Halakhah, sectarian Halakhah, and the Jewish constitution, including the priests, the Sanhedrin, the rights of kings, the Temple, procedure (judgment, execution), evidence (including admission) of guilt, oaths, possession and presumption, and bills.

JACKSON (2048g), pp. 3–4, asserts that both Philo and Josephus write with an eye to a Gentile audience. He remarks that overtones of Roman law, designed presumably to smooth the way with a Roman audience, seep through.

SCHIFFMAN (2048h), pp. 12–13, warns that Josephus' rewriting of the Bible is for a non-Jewish audience and is intended to amalgamate Judaism with a Greek point of view. Both Philo and Josephus, he asserts, often derive their statements from Scriptural exegesis of their own and may not represent the normative Halakhah of their own day.

GOLDENBERG (2048i) presents a comparison of four instances in Halakhah in Antiquities 4. 274–276 with their parallels in Tannaitic literature: the laws of the lost object, of assistance to beasts, of showing the road, and of reviling the deaf. In each case he contends that Josephus' version agrees in detail with the Tannaitic law.

GOLDENBERG (2048j), in his doctoral dissertation, argues that Josephus' deviations from the Bible regarding Jewish law are paralleled in tannaitic sources, Ben Sira, Philo, the New Testament, and Targumim. His work admittedly is not comprehensive but restricts itself to the following topics: the rebellious elder, the rebellious son and honor to parents, execution and burial of criminals, usury, loans, pledges, the housebreaker, restitution of lost property, assistance to beasts in distress, directions on the road, reviling the deaf, quarrels and resulting injuries, withholding wages, burial and funeral rites, mourning rites, respect for the aged, martyrdom, and false prophecy. He claims that the alleged contradictions between Josephus and rabbinic halakhah, for the most part, do not exist. In point after point he asserts that when Josephus adds to the Bible he reflects contemporary Halakhah. GOLDENBERG says that Josephus is a

source of the law, not necessarily as it was practiced, but as it was interpreted by the sages of his day. He concludes that Josephus had a written code before him, since he often breaks down the Biblical law into more precisely defined cases, exactly as one would find in a legal code. We may reply that Josephus does not claim to impart developed Halakhah, but only the Biblical text. Moreover, we may add, when Josephus supplements or subtracts from the Bible, our first question should be: what was Josephus' Biblical text? GOLDENBERG claims that according to a recently discovered manuscript of the Talmud, 'Avodah Zarah 8b, Rabbi Judah ben Baba wrote down the Halakhah as early as the time of Josephus; but we may reply that Judah survived Bar Kochba's rebellion (132–135 C.E.), and hence it is more likely that he wrote down the Halakhah after Josephus' time. As to GOLDENBERG's claim that the Dead Sea manuscripts constitute Halakhah committed to writing, they are not Halakhah but are sectarian. As to GOLDENBERG's assertion that Josephus reflects contemporary Halakhah, this is begging the question, since we can almost never be sure what the contemporary Halakhah was. We may also remark that Josephus' addition of reasons for some of the laws may suggest that Josephus believed in seeking such reasons, just as Rabbi Simeon bar Yohai did (Kiddushin 68b). Still, this is the most thorough treatment of Josephus' Halakhah to date, although it is admittedly selective, and constitutes a major advance on the dissertation of LEVINE (2048b). In an appendix, pp. 218–235, GOLDENBERG attacks ALTSHULER (2048), who had argued that contemporary legal materials in the 'Antiquities' with Scriptural parallels consistently demonstrate apologetic tendencies of Josephus and who considers the 'Antiquities' on a par with 'Against Apion' as an *apologia*. GOLDENBERG argues that the fact that we find some of Josephus' additions in Tannaitic law shows that it is not apologetic. We may, however, ask why it cannot be both, and why Josephus does not include other Tannaitic law in his work.

EPSTEIN (2048k) cites Josephus often in seeking to trace the development of Halakhah.

GILAT (2048l), in his systematic study of Rabbi Eliezer's views on all matters of Halakhah, like EPSTEIN, cites Josephus as evidence for earlier Halakhah. He concludes that Rabbi Eliezer stood for the early Halakhah based on oral tradition, whereas the later Halakhah was more liberal. We may comment that he does not take into sufficient account the possibility that Josephus' may be merely apologetic.

I have not seen CROUCH (2048m), pp. 82–83, who contends that Josephus' summary of Jewish law (Apion 2. 190–219) reflects the Stoic theme of the *καθῆκον*.

ELON (2048n), vol. 3, pp. 843–844, cites several examples where Josephus adds to Scripture in his Halakhic interpretations. He cites approvingly the remark of SCHALIT (2048o), vol. 2, p. 82, n. 108, that Josephus wanted merely to make an impression upon his Hellenistic-Roman readers in introducing his modifications. We may comment that Josephus had so many enemies who were looking for signs of heresy in his words or deeds that he could hardly have escaped sharp criticism if he had chosen to make such an impression.

## 20.1: Courts, Witnesses, and Punishments

- (2049) SAMUEL BELKIN: In His Image: The Jewish Philosophy of Man as Expressed in Rabbinic Tradition. London 1960.
- (2050) AKIVA GILBOA: The Intervention of Sextus Julius Caesar, Governor of Syria, in the Affair of Herod's Trial. In: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 5, 1979–80, pp. 185–194.
- (2051) STEVEN RISKIN: The Halakhah in Josephus as Reflected in *Against Apion* and *The Life*. Diss., M. A., Yeshiva University, New York 1970.
- (2052) HAIM COHN: Flavius Josephus as Historian of the Laws of Punishment (in Hebrew). Unpublished lecture, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 27 March 1972.
- (2053) LOUIS GINZBERG: The Legends of the Jews. Vol. 6. Philadelphia 1928.
- (2054) HENDRIK VAN VLIET: No Single Testimony. A Study on the Adoption of the Law of Deut. 19:16 par. into the New Testament (*Studia theologica Rheno-Traiectina*, 4). Utrecht 1958.
- (2054a) HARRY O. H. LEVINE: Halakah in Josephus: Public and Criminal Law. Diss., Dropsie College, Philadelphia 1935.
- (2054b) NATHAN DRAZIN: History of Jewish Education from 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E. (during the periods of the second commonwealth and the Tannaim). Baltimore 1940 (rpt. from the John Hopkins University Studies in Education, no. 29; published also as diss., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 1937). Trans. into Hebrew by MEIR ZALZER: Jerusalem 1965.
- (2054c) MATHIAS DELCOR: The Courts of the Church of Corinth and the Courts of Qumran. In: JEROME MURPHY-O'CONNOR, ed., *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Chicago 1968. Pp. 69–84.
- (2054d) J. E. ALLEN: Why Pilate? In: *Festschrift C. F. D. Moule*. London 1970. Pp. 78–83.
- (2054e) IRÉNÉE FRANSEN: L'historien Flavius-Josèphe et le supplice de la croix. In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 133, 1971, p. 5.
- (2054f) LUC DEQUEKER: Pharisees and Pharisaism: Vital Link in Transmission of Torah. In: *Service International de Documentation Judéo-Chrétienne* 10. 2, 1977, pp. 4–11.
- (2054g) LOUIS GINZBERG: Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte. New York 1922; rpt. Hildesheim 1972. Trans. into English by RALPH MARCUS et al.: *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (Moreshet Series, 1). New York 1976.
- (2054h) JOHN DUNCAN M. DERRETT: Law in the New Testament: Si scandalizaverit te manus tua absconde illam (Mk. ix. 43) and comparative legal history. In: *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité* 20, 1973, pp. 11–36. Rpt. in his: *Studies in the New Testament*. Vol. 1. Leiden 1977. Pp. 4–31.
- (2054i) MARTIN HENGEL: Mors turpissima crucis. Die Kreuzigung in der antiken Welt und die 'Torheit' des Wortes vom Kreuz. In: JOHANNES FRIEDRICH, WOLFGANG PÖHLMANN, and PETER STUHLMACHER, edd., *Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70. Geburtstag*. Tübingen 1976. Pp. 125–184.

BELKIN (2049), pp. 72–77, notes that Josephus, like the Talmud, insists (Ant. 4. 224) that the king is subject to the courts. This is borne out, says BELKIN, in the trial of Herod (Ant. 14. 168ff.); but we must note that Herod did not become king until later (Ant. 14. 386–389). The fact, we may add, that the Roman governor Sextus (Ant. 14. 170) insisted that Herod was not subject to local jurisdiction but only to a Roman tribunal may, indeed, as GILBOA (2050) concludes, be based on Roman precedent; but it is clear from the context in Josephus that the Jewish people regarded him as subject to the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin.



In *Against Apion* 2. 207, Josephus says that a judge who accepts bribes suffers capital punishment; but there is no such penalty either in the Bible or in the Talmud. RISKIN (2051) notes that, according to the rabbis' understanding of the seven Noachian commandments which are incumbent upon Gentiles, if a Gentile judge accepts a bribe he is indeed put to death. He suggests that Josephus took Deuteronomy 27. 25, which declared accursed one who has accepted a bribe, to refer to a case where the death penalty was inflicted because of a wrong decision and where the judge is consequently, as in Philo and in Karaitic law, declared guilty of murder.

COHN (2052) notes that according to the earlier Roman law (*lex Cornelia testamentaria*) of 81 B.C.E., exile was the penalty for a judge who accepted a bribe, and that it was not until 392, long after Josephus, that the death penalty was prescribed. He says that Josephus' statement is intended to stress how seriously the Torah viewed this crime. We may suggest that Josephus, for apologetic reasons, did not want to have it appear that the law is more stringent on Gentile than on Jewish judges and therefore applied the same penalty to both.

GINZBERG (2053), p. 312, n. 39, notes that whereas the Bible in I Kings 21. 13 (as well as the Septuagint, we may add) speaks of two false witnesses, Josephus (*Ant.* 8. 358) mentions three witnesses against Naboth and concludes that this presupposes an old Halakhah according to which cases involving capital punishment required three witnesses (i. e. one accuser and two witnesses). We may comment that the Torah itself (Deuteronomy 19. 15 cf. *Ant.* 4. 219) has a peculiar statement, "At the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall a matter be established". It is never stated under what circumstances three witnesses are required; and indeed in Talmudic law there is never such a requirement. But Josephus may reflect an understanding of Deuteronomy 19. 15 which is rejected by the rabbis.

VAN VLIET (2054), pp. 26–30, cites *Life* 256, where Josephus says that if he had produced two or three excellent men as witnesses to his behavior he would have been acquitted of the charge against him produced by John of Gischala, but he wisely refrains from concluding from this that this is evidence for legal procedure; perhaps he has adopted a familiar motif. VAN VLIET says that there are no signs that Josephus held in such high esteem the law requiring two or three witnesses, and that the fact that he does not cite it in his summary of Jewish law in 'Against Apion', Book 2, confirms this. But, we must comment, it would be hard to believe, in view of Josephus' profession of strict 'orthodoxy' in *Antiquities* 4. 196 and elsewhere, that he did not take seriously a law explicitly stated in the Torah itself (Deuteronomy 19. 15); and the *argumentum ex silentio* from Josephus' silence in 'Against Apion' is particularly weak in view of the highly selective nature of that summary.

LEVINE (2054a), pp. 103–109, after comparing Josephus and Philo with regard to the punishment of poisoners, concludes that neither is indebted to the other and that each was transmitting experiences characteristic of his environment. We may comment, however, that to conclude that Josephus gives us a date before which and after which the law applied because of his omissions is to make of his work a book of law, which it is not.

DRAZIN (2054b), pp. 124–125, comments particularly on Josephus' statement (Ant. 4. 219) that the testimony of women is inadmissible in Jewish law because of their levity and because of the boldness of their sex. The rabbis have no such statement (the rabbinic statement, Kiddushin 80b, that women are light-minded refers to their inability to withstand torture); and DRAZIN conjectures that Josephus was influenced by the Greek and Roman attitudes toward women.

DELCOR (2054c), p. 71, shows that the Jews of the Diaspora had their own courts for civil cases.

ALLEN (2054d) comments on John 18. 31 (cf. Acts 13. 28) and the question of Jewish capital punishment (War 2. 117, 6. 126; Ant. 18. 1–2).

I have not seen FRANSEN (2054e). [See *infra*, p. 944.]

DEQUEKER (2054f), p. 9, comments on Josephus' statements that a woman's testimony cannot be accepted because of the frivolity and boldness of her sex, while a slave's is inadmissible because it could be influenced by fear. He concludes that what Josephus says about women is his personal opinion rather than that of the Bible or of the rabbis, and that the reason for his view is that in ancient law women were regarded similarly to minors and slaves who were not *sui iuris*. We may comment that Josephus has connected two disparate statements, one that women's testimony is inadmissible and the other that women are light-minded.

GINZBERG (2054g), pp. 48–49, comments on the Tannaitic Halakhah that every court had two Levites as attendants (Ant. 4. 214; cf. Sifre Deuteronomy 15, p. 25).

DERRET (2054h) cites Life 170–173 and 177 and War 2. 642–643 as evidence that the amputation of hands was in force as a penalty in first-century Palestine. He notes that Josephus is aware of the notion that historical persons such as Herod (War 1. 656, Ant. 17. 169) were eaten by worms while still alive (so also Plutarch, Sulla 36. 3). We may comment that the instances cited by Josephus of cutting off of hands are all instances of military or popular 'justice' and that there is no evidence in the Talmudic literature that such a penalty was inflicted by the rabbis.

HENGEL (2054i) surveys the references to crucifixion in antiquity, including Josephus (War 2. 241, 253, 306, 308, 3. 321, 5. 289, 449–451; Ant. 17. 295, 20. 129) and concludes that it is no accident that for the period of Josephus there is no case of crucifixion among Jews reported.

## 20.2: Religious Law: the Priesthood and Other Laws of Ritual

(2055) STEVEN RISKIN: The Halakhah in Josephus as Reflected in *Against Apion* and *The Life*. Diss., M. A., Yeshiva University, New York 1970.

(2055a) EBERHARD GÜTING, ed.: Die Mischna. I. Seder: Zeraim. 6. Traktat: Terumot (Priester-heben). Berlin 1969.

(2055b) MICHAEL KRUPP: 'Arakin (Schätzungen). Die Mischna, ed. KARL H. RENGSTORF and LEONHARD ROST. V, 5. Berlin 1971.

- (2055c) GEDALYAHU ALON: The Bounds of the Laws of Levitical Cleanness. In his: *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 190–234.
- (2055d) DAVID DAUBE: Three Legal Notes on Josephus after His Surrender. In: *Law Quarterly Review* (London) 93, 1977, pp. 191–194.
- (2055e) AHARON OPPENHEIMER: The 'Am Ha-arets: A Study in the Social History of the Jewish People in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. Trans. from Hebrew by I. H. LEVINE. Leiden 1977.
- (2055f) LEE LEVINE: R. Simeon b. Yohai and the Purification of Tiberias: History and Tradition. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 49, 1978, pp. 143–185.

Josephus (Against Apion 1. 31) says that a priest must marry a woman of his own race, that is, not a proselyte. Yet the Torah (Leviticus 21. 14) says that only the high priest is forbidden to a proselyte. But, as RISKIN (2055) remarks, inasmuch as the Mishnah (Yevamoth 6. 5) defines a prostitute as including a proselyte and inasmuch as, according to the Torah (Leviticus 21. 7), an ordinary priest may not marry a prostitute, Josephus follows the point of view which concludes that the ordinary priest is likewise prohibited to marry a proselyte.

Josephus (Against Apion 1. 35) says that a priest is forbidden to marry a captive woman because she is suspected of having had frequent intercourse with foreigners, and in this he agrees with the Mishnah (Yevamoth 6. 5). Indeed, when he declares that he himself married a captive woman he states (Life 414) that it was at the command of Vespasian and that she was a virgin. Josephus, however, adds (Against Apion 1. 33) that the priest must investigate the genealogy of the father and remote ancestors, whereas the Mishnah (Kiddushin 4. 4) mentions only a maternal investigation. Perhaps, says RISKIN, Josephus reflects an earlier, more stringent practice. We may add that in matters of the priesthood Josephus, as priest, tends to be particularly strict.

As to the rites accorded to the dead, Josephus is in agreement with the Talmud when he says (Against Apion 2. 205) that there should be neither expensive funeral honors nor conspicuous memorials for the dead and that those who pass by a funeral procession should join it. The Talmud (Mo'ed Katan 24b) similarly says that Rabban Gamaliel, an older contemporary of Josephus, willed that he be dressed in simple shrouds so as to break with the tendency toward ever more expensive funerals, and that the rest of the nation followed his conspicuous example. The Jerusalem Talmud (Shekalim 2. 7. 47a; cf. Genesis Rabbah 82. 10) says that monuments are not erected for the righteous, since their words are their memorials. Similarly, the Babylonian Talmud declares (Kethuboth 17a) that participation in a funeral procession takes precedence even over Torah study.

GÜTING (2055a), pp. 18–22, commenting on Josephus' use of the word ἀπαρχή, concludes that in general Josephus shows himself well acquainted with the system of priestly taxation of his time.

KRUPP (2055b), p. 14, commenting on Antiquities 4. 73, notes that Philo and Josephus adhere to the institution of *'arakhin*, though concrete cases of evaluation were apparently not current for them, and regard it as necessary to explain it to their readers.

ALON (2055c), pp. 226–229, says that Josephus (Apion 2. 26) agrees with Philo (De Specialibus Legibus 3. 205) that the law concerning defilement by the

dead is designed to serve as a fence against the shedding of blood. He remarks, furthermore, that the removal of the menstruant from pure things and her separation from the public on account of uncleanness, to which Josephus (Ant. 3. 113) testifies, is also taught by tradition (Tanna de-be Eliyyahu, M. FRIEDMANN [ISH-SHALOM], ed., 16. 75–76).

DAUBE (2055d), commenting on Life 414, notes that Josephus' bride is described as a virgin, since Josephus was a priest and therefore not permitted to marry a captive, inasmuch as the assumption is that captives have been abused.

OPPENHEIMER (2055e), pp. 37–41, concludes that the statements of Josephus in the 'Antiquities' and the 'Life' show that at the end of the Second Temple period it was customary to give tithes to the priests. He admits that in some passages Philo and Josephus state that the tithes were given to the priests, in some they were given to both priests and Levites, and in others to the Levites alone. These contradictions are to be explained as a confusion between the practice that prevailed in the period of the Second Temple, on the one hand, and the Biblical law in Numbers and perhaps also the Halakhah based on that Biblical law, on the other hand.

LEVINE (2055f) notes that, according to Josephus (Ant. 18. 38), because Tiberias had been built on the site of tombs, purity was an issue from the time of its foundation. LEVINE, however, distrusts Josephus' account, since Josephus was in disagreement with a number of factions in the city. He cites as evidence for his distrust the fact that many rabbis visited the city at the end of the first and at the beginning of the second century. We may comment that LEVINE himself admits that the rabbinic traditions (Genesis Rabbah 79 *et alibi*) agree that the issue of impurity was a serious one affecting the entire city. Apparently, the common sense point of view prevailed among the rabbis, as expressed by Rabbi Joshua ben Ḥananiah, when religious zealots used the discovery of human bones in the Temple area as a pretext for declaring Jerusalem unclean and he asked where the bones of the dead drowned in the Flood were or of those whom Nebuchadnezzar slew.

### 20.3: The Calendar

(2055g) J. VAN GOUDOEVER: Biblical Calendars. Leiden 1959; 2nd ed. 1961. Trans. into French by MARIE-LUC KERREMANS: Fêtes et calendriers bibliques, 3rd ed. Paris 1967.

(2055h) WERNER EISS: Der Kalender des nachexilischen Judentums (mit Ausnahme des essenischen Kalenders). In: Die Welt des Orients 3, 1964–66, pp. 44–47.

(2055i) ROGER T. BECKWITH: The Day, Its Divisions and Its Limits, in Biblical Thought. In: Evangelical Quarterly 43, 1971, pp. 218–227.

GOUDOEVER (2055g) has numerous references to Josephus in relation to the Talmud, the Pseudepigrapha, Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the New Testament.

EISS (2055h) asserts that the calendar was not in a set form during the post-exilic period, and that it is doubtful whether Josephus, in citing the Macedonian names of the months, in reality refers to the parallel Jewish months. EISS follows

the Mishnah against NIESE, who says that the Jews at the time of Jesus had set the Tyrian sun-calendar as their guide and that they followed the lunar calendar only for setting the festivals.

BECKWITH (2055i) notes that Josephus says that none of the flesh of the Passover lamb is left until the next day (Ant. 3.248). This shows, says BECKWITH, that Josephus is equally happy with a second way of reckoning the days of these festivals, according to which they begin and end at daybreak.

#### 20.4: The Sabbath

- (2056) FRANZ PETTIRSCH: Das Verbot der Opera servilia in der heiligen Schrift und in der altkirchlichen Exegese. In: Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie 69, 1947, pp. 257–327, 417–444.
- (2057) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Edict of Augustus Caesar in Relation to the Judaeans of Asia. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 55, 1964–65, pp. 160–163.
- (2058) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: The Great Sanhedrin. Philadelphia 1953.
- (2059) MOSHE D. HERR: The Problem of War on the Sabbath in the Second Temple and the Talmudic Periods (in Hebrew). In: Tarbiz 30, 1960–61, pp. 242–256, 341–356.
- (2060) ALGER F. JOHNS: The Military Strategy of Sabbath Attacks on the Jews. In: Vetus Testamentum 13, 1963, pp. 482–486.
- (2061) DONALD J. WISEMAN: Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings (626–556 B.C.) in the British Museum. London 1956.
- (2062) LEAH BRONNER: Sects and Separatism During the Second Jewish Commonwealth: A study of the origin of Religious Separatism with special reference to the rise, growth and development of the Various Sects, including the Dead Sea Community (originally a thesis for a Master's degree at the University of Witwatersrand, South Africa). New York 1967.
- (2063) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews. Philadelphia 1959.
- (2064) SAMSON HELFGOTT: Observance of the Sabbath in the Graeco-Roman Period. Diss., D.H.L., Yeshiva University, New York 1974.
- (2064a) S. T. KIMBROUGH: The Concept of Sabbath at Qumran. In: Revue de Qumran 5, 1964–66, pp. 483–502.
- (2064b) LARRIMORE CROCKETT: Luke IV. 16–30 and the Jewish Lectionary Cycle: A Word of Caution. In: Journal of Jewish Studies 17, 1966, pp. 13–46.
- (2064c) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Pour une histoire des noms grecs du Sabbat et de la Pâque. In: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Comptes Rendus, Jan.-March 1971, pp. 71–77; + pp. 77–83 (reservations by ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER).
- (2064d) LAWRENCE H. SCHIFFMAN: The Halakhah at Qumran. Diss., 2 vols., Brandeis Univ., Waltham, Mass. 1974. Publ. (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 16): Leiden 1975.
- (2064e) JAKOB NAHUM EPSTEIN: Introduction to Tannaitic Literature: Mishna, Tosephta and Halakhic Midrashim (in Hebrew). Ed. EZRA Z. MELAMED, Jerusalem 1957.

PETTIRSCH (2056) surveys the references to prohibition of work on Sabbaths and festivals in the Bible, the Apocrypha, Philo, Josephus (pp. 312–314), the Midrash, and Christian writings. He contends that in his casuistry (though it seems hardly excessive) Josephus is a child of his age and that he is in accord with the Mishnah, but that he has added motifs for apologetic reasons. Very questionable is his conclusion that Josephus was especially influenced by Philo in

his view of the social and humanitarian significance of the Sabbath, since such views are paralleled in rabbinic writings as well.

ZEITLIN (2057) comments on the exemption granted by Augustus (Ant. 16. 163) to Jews from appearing in court on the Sabbath and on the day of preparation, i. e. Sabbath evening. He contends that the expression for the latter (παρασκευή, "preparation") was coined by the Jews of the Hellenistic Diaspora, since it is found in the Gospels but not in rabbinic or Judaeo-Hellenistic literature. But, we may comment, recent studies tend to blur the difference between Diaspora Greek and the Greek widely spoken in Palestine. Moreover, despite ZEITLIN, there is a similar concept in rabbinic literature, *hakhen*o, "preparation", a medical term going back to the Biblical precept (Exodus 16. 15) to prepare the manna on the sixth day for the Sabbath, and referring, in general, to designating something for use on the Sabbaths or Holy Days. Thus the Babylonian Talmud (Bezah 2b) says: "A weekday may prepare for the Sabbath, and a weekday may prepare for a festival". Similarly, the Jerusalem Talmud (Shabbath 3. 6b) declares: "There is nothing which exists in the shape in which it is made which may not be considered as designated for use [on the Sabbath]".

The question of the permissibility of fighting on the Sabbath has drawn considerable scholarly attention. HOENIG (2058), p. 93, notes stages in the development of the law: at first, in pre-Hasmonean days (before 165 B.C.E.), the Jews desisted even from defensive war on the Sabbath; secondly, Mattathias (Ant. 12. 276–277), during the struggle against Antiochus Epiphanes, sanctioned defensive warfare on the Sabbath; thirdly, Hillel permitted even offensive battle. But Hillel's decision, we may note, did not win universal acceptance, and we hear of the refusal at first of the followers of the Jew Asinaeus in their quasi-independent state in Babylonia to fight on the Sabbath. Long after Hillel there were some who refused to fight on the Sabbath during the great revolt against Rome. HERR (2059), however, rightly emphasizes that, to judge especially from War 2. 517, the Jews generally did fight on the Sabbath during the great revolt.

JOHNS (2060) notes that according to WISEMAN (2061), in his publication of the 'Chronicles of Chaldean Kings', the final assault on Jerusalem occurred on March 16, 597, a Saturday. The Biblical record indicates that in 588 and again in 587 attacks occurred on a Saturday. All this supports Josephus and I Maccabees 2. 39ff. that Jews refused to fight on the Sabbath until the time of Mattathias.

BRONNER (2062), commenting on the unopposed entry of Ptolemy Soter into Jerusalem on the Sabbath, says that there is a contradiction between Antiquities 12. 4, which states that the Jews permitted him to do so because they did not suspect any hostile act, and Against Apion 1. 210, which does not speak of his guile. But, we may comment, Josephus cites Agatharchides as his source in both passages: the reference in 'Against Apion' is a quotation, and that in the 'Antiquities' is Josephus' rewording of the text. The statement that the Jews did not suspect Ptolemy to be their enemy is not from Agatharchides but from Josephus, or, alternatively, it supplements the statement in 'Against Apion'.

A contradiction with Josephus' account is to be found in Hecataeus (cited in Against Apion 1. 186–189), who adopts a favorable attitude toward Ptolemy. TCHERIKOVER (2063), pp. 55–58, with some diffidence, attempts to reconcile this

account with Antiquities 12. 4 by referring the passages to different invasions of Palestine by Ptolemy.

HELFGOTT (2064) declines to accept HOENIG's theory of the development of Halakhah regarding fighting on the Sabbath. Noting that even after Mattathias sanctioned defensive warfare, there were several occasions when Jews declined to defend themselves on the Sabbath, he refuses to accept the distinction between offensive and defensive warfare. In support we may cite Life 161–162, where Josephus says that the news of the approaching Roman cavalry filled him with alarm, since he had dismissed his soldiers, the next day being the Sabbath. He adds that even if they had returned, it would have been impossible for them to take up arms, “such action being forbidden by our laws, however urgent the necessity”. The situation here, we may add, was one of defensive warfare, and yet Josephus states that his men would have refused to fight on the Sabbath. Still, we may counter, if so, why did Pompey only set up siege works and not fight on the Sabbath (Ant. 14. 64; War 1. 146)? If there were some who refused to fight even defensively these were pietists who went beyond the law, just as today, even though it is permitted and indeed commanded to violate the Sabbath to save a life, there are some who will not violate the Sabbath even under such circumstances.

KIMBROUGH (2064a) emphasizes the common point of intellectual origin of the Pharisees and the Essenes (whom he equates with the Dead Sea Sect), at least in the matter of Sabbath Halakhah. He says that the concept of the Sabbath at Qumran is not more strict than that of the Pharisees; but we may comment that the newly published Temple Scroll of the Sect shows extraordinary strictness, so that, for example, the members may not leave their homes on the Sabbath and may not even urinate on the Sabbath.

CROCKETT (2064b) notes that Josephus (Apion 2. 175) is the earliest evidence for a reading of the weekly portion of the Torah in the synagogue. CROCKETT says that Josephus is here referring to the readings on the Sabbath, but that this may also include weekly readings. If so, we may ask, why does Josephus say that people at this time deserted their other occupations? This must, therefore, refer to the prohibition of work on the Sabbath.

PELLETIER (2064c), commenting on Antiquities 1. 33 (*et alibi*) and Antiquities 2. 313 (*et alibi*) concludes that the words for Sabbath (σάββατα) and Passover (πάσχα) were not hellenized but preserved by Josephus from the time when Aramaic had already resisted Hebrew. The article concludes with reservations expressed by DUPONT-SOMMER.

SCHIFFMAN (2064d), pp. 86–87, commenting on Antiquities 16. 163, where the Emperor Augustus assures the Jews that they will not be forced to come to court to testify after 3 P.M. on Friday, asserts that this does not prove that there existed a custom of abstaining from labor from 3 P.M. on.

EPSTEIN (2064e), pp. 277–278, postulates that the stringencies of the Jews generally in abstaining from fighting on the Sabbath (War 1. 146) and of the Essenes (War 2. 147), in particular, agree with the earlier Halakhah.

## 20.5: Sabbatical Years and Jubilees

- (2065) ROBERT NORTH: Maccabean Sabbath Years. In: *Biblica* 34, 1953, pp. 501–515.  
 (2066) JOHANNES SCHAUMBERGER: Die neue Seleukiden-Liste BM 35603 und die makka-bäische Chronologie. In: *Biblica* 36, 1955, pp. 423–435.  
 (2067) JOHN C. DANCY: A Commentary on I Maccabees. Oxford 1954.  
 (2068) DIETRICH CORRENS, ed. and trans.: *Die Mischna: Schebiit*. Berlin 1960.  
 (2068a) ROBERT G. NORTH: *Sociology of the Biblical Jubilee*. Rome 1954.  
 (2068b) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: The Calendar of Sabbatical Cycles during the Second Temple and the Early Rabbinic Period. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44, 1973, pp. 153–196.

NORTH (2065) asserts that the several passages in Josephus (*Ant.* 12. 378, etc.) referring to famines which resulted from the observance of Sabbatical years are tendentious. He declares that Josephus invented the hardships which resulted from this observance so as to glorify Torah-observance and to extenuate military setbacks; but NORTH, we may comment, totally disregards the Talmudic evidence, which corroborates Josephus in noting these hardships.

SCHAUMBERGER (2066) cites the inexactness of Josephus' chronology (*Ant.* 13. 234) on the entrance of the Sabbatical year.

DANCY (2067), p. 113, notes that the Sabbatical year implied in *Antiquities* 13. 234 (*War* 1. 60), when taken together with I Maccabees 16. 14, is 134/133, but that there are strong reasons for doubting the historicity of Josephus' account, since he implies that the Sabbatical year required cessation from war, though there is no indication of this in the Bible or in the Talmud. CORRENS (2068) suggests that Josephus is here following a pagan source which had a false understanding of the Sabbatical year. A close look at Josephus' text, however, we may note, will show that he does not say that it was forbidden to fight during the Sabbatical year. If Ptolemy felt relieved of the war, as Josephus (*War* 13. 235) says, it was because he thought that Jews would not be able to carry on a war so long as they did not till their fields.

CORRENS (2068), who has a systematic treatment of the chronology of the Sabbatical years during this entire period and with particular reference to Sabbatical years noted by Josephus, asserts that starting with *Antiquities* 14. 487 Josephus begins to use a hostile source, and so he thereafter prefers the account in the 'War'; but we may ask why Josephus, in a work that is generally more favorable to the Jews, the 'Antiquities', should have selected a hostile source. Josephus (*War* 4. 529–537) shows that the Sabbatical year was not observed by the Idumaeans rather than that the Sabbatical year in general was not observed. Again, with regard to the year 40–41, he asks how Petronius could have failed to realize that this was a Sabbatical year and concludes that the historicity of Josephus' account must be doubted. But we must note that Petronius was Roman governor in Syria, where the laws of the Sabbatical year do not apply.

NORTH (2068a), pp. 82–87, concludes, on the basis of Josephus' references to jubilees, that we have insufficient grounds either to affirm or to deny that the jubilee was ever observed in practice. The historical observance of certain Sabbatical years claimed by Josephus is, he says, inconsistent and unreliable and



hence cannot provide any argument for the dating or enforcement of the jubilees.

WACHOLDER (2068b), pp. 158–160, commenting on Antiquities 11. 313–347, concludes that it is likely that the privilege of observing the Sabbatical year was granted to the Jews in 331 B.C.E., some time after Alexander's conquest of Tyre and Gaza. He asserts that Josephus' dating of Simon's death (Ant. 13. 228) during the Sabbatical year of 135–134 B.C.E. offers unambiguous testimony for the calendar of Sabbatical cycles which WACHOLDER appends. As to War 1. 343–357 and Antiquities 14. 465–491, where Josephus speaks of a Sabbatical year in connection with the siege of Jerusalem by Herod and the Roman Sossius, WACHOLDER says that Josephus' evidence is contradictory, since Antiquities 14. 475 suggests that the Sabbatical year was in 38–37 B.C.E. whereas Antiquities 15. 7 indicates that it was in 37–36.

## 20.6: Festivals

- (2069) SHMUEL SAFRAI: Pilgrimage in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1958. Printed: Tel-Aviv 1965. English summary in: Immanuel 5, 1975, pp. 51–62.
- (2070) SHMUEL SAFRAI: The Activities of Pilgrims in Jerusalem in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: Sinai 46, 1959, pp. 189–200.
- (2071) SHMUEL SAFRAI: Passover in Jerusalem in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: Maḥanayim 38, 1959, pp. 137–146.
- (2072) GRACE AMADON: Important Passover Texts in Josephus and Philo. In: Anglican Theological Review 27, 1945, pp. 109–115.
- (2073) ANTONIOS KERAMOPOULLOS: To Paskha, ta arnia kai ta auga (in modern Greek). In: Praktika tēs Akadēmias Athēnōn 28, 1953, pp. 283–284.
- (2074) AUGUST STROBEL: Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f. In: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 49, 1958, pp. 157–196.
- (2074a) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Time of the Passover Meal. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 42, 1951–52, pp. 45–50.
- (2074b) JEAN CARMIGNAC: Comment Jésus et ses contemporains pouvaient-ils célébrer la Pâque à une date non officielle? In: Revue de Qumran 5, 1964–66, pp. 59–79.
- (2074c) WOLFGANG HUBER: Passa und Ostern. Untersuchungen zur Osterfeier der alten Kirche (Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche, Beiheft 35). Berlin 1969.
- (2074d) SHMUEL SAFRAI: Pilgrimage to Jerusalem at the End of the Second Temple Period. In: Studies on the Jewish Background of the New Testament. Preface by H. van Praag. Assen 1969. Pp. 12–21.
- (2074e) HERBERT HAAG: Vom alten zum neuen Pascha. Geschichte und Theologie des Osterfestes. Stuttgart 1971.
- (2074f) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Pour une histoire des noms grecs du Sabbat et de la Pâque. In: Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Comptes Rendus, Jan.-March 1971, pp. 71–77; + pp. 77–83 (reservations by ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER).
- (2074g) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: La nomenclature du calendrier juif à l'époque hellénistique. In: Revue Biblique 82, 1975, pp. 218–233.
- (2074h) FRITZ CHENDERLIN: Distributed Observance of the Passover – A Hypothesis. In: Biblica 56, 1975, pp. 369–393.

- (2074i) JOHN BOWMAN: *The Fourth Gospel and the Jews: a Study in R. Akiba, Esther, and the Gospel of John* (Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 8). Pittsburgh 1975.
- (2075) CARSTEN COLPE: *Xylophoria*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 2. Reihe, 9. 2, 1967, cols. 2172–2173.
- (2076) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans.: *Josephus*, vol. 2, *The Jewish War*, Books I–III (Loeb Classical Library). London 1927.
- (2077) SVERRE AALEN: *Die Begriffe 'Licht' und 'Finsternis' im alten Testament, im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus*. Oslo 1951.
- (2077a) JAKOB NAHUM EPSTEIN: *Introduction to Tannaitic Literature: Mishna, Tosephta and Halakhic Midrashim* (in Hebrew). Ed. EZRA Z. MELAMED. Jerusalem 1957.
- (2078) OLIVER SHAW RANKIN: *The Origins of the Festival of Hanukkah*. Edinburgh 1930.
- (2079) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Hanukkah. Its Origin and Its Significance*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 29, 1938–39, pp. 1–36. Rpt. in his: *Solomon Zeitlin's Studies in the Early History of Judaism*. Vol. 1. New York 1973. Pp. 239–274.
- (2080) SALOMON STEIN: *The Liturgy of Hanukkah and the First Two Books of Maccabees*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 5, 1954, pp. 100–106, 148–155.
- (2081) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: *Le Cadre Historique des Fêtes de Hanukkah et de Purîm*. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 15, 1965, pp. 238–270.

SAFRAI (2069) (2070) draws especially on Josephus and compares him with the Talmud in the description of the pilgrims' stay in Jerusalem and their participation in the great festivals of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles. He stresses that a major goal of the commandment to go to Jerusalem for these festivals was to promote feelings of mutual affection by common banquets. SAFRAI (2071) presents a general popular survey of the laws and customs of pilgrims in Jerusalem, drawing upon Josephus and the Talmud.

AMADON (2072) discusses several passages in Josephus referring to the time of the Passover sacrifice and supper. She concludes that the term *πάσχα* commonly refers not to the paschal sacrifice but to the festival of Passover and cites War 2. 10 and 6. 423 and Antiquities 2. 313 and 17. 213 (add 14. 21, 14. 25). But we may comment that in Josephus the term *πάσχα* is used with reference to the sacrifice (in addition to Antiquities 3. 248 and 11. 110 cited by Amadon add 3. 294 and 9. 271). In the Talmud, we may add, the term is widely used for both the name of the sacrifice and that of the festival; but the usual name of the festival both in Josephus and in the Talmud is "the Festival of Unleavened Bread" (*הַתּוֹרֵן הַבְּרוֹשׁ הַבְּרוֹשׁ הַבְּרוֹשׁ*); indeed, we may note, this phrase is found twenty-two times in Josephus' works.

KERAMOPOULLOS (2073) compares the account of the celebration by King Josiah of Passover in Josephus (Ant. 10. 70–72) with some Christian interpretations.

STROBEL (2074), especially pp. 186–195, discusses Josephus' numerous accounts of gatherings in Jerusalem on Passover. He infers that the Masada episode is connected with Passover and that Josephus' silence about this connection is due to his eagerness not to stress the Messianic aspect of the rebellion; but we may note that Josephus nowhere connects Passover with Messianic aspirations.

ZEITLIN (2074a) notes that in War 6. 423 Josephus mentions the Festival of Unleavened Bread but specifies the Passover only in connection with the slaughtering of the Paschal lamb, whereas in Antiquities 2. 313 and 14. 25 he refers to the festival which is called Passover but does not use the term 'Festival of Unleavened Bread'. ZEITLIN explains the discrepancy, noting that after the destruction of the Temple the sages called the festival Passover and not Festival of Unleavened Bread, as in the Bible, and that thus the term Festival of Passover was new when Josephus wrote the books of the 'Antiquities'. Hence he speaks of the festival which is called Passover to convey something new which was not known to his readers at large.

CARMIGNAC (2074b), commenting on War 1. 73 and 1. 78–80, asserts that in 103 B.C.E. the Essenes, partisans of the solar calendar, frequented the Temple on Tabernacles. Hence, there might have been a double date for Passover also according to the two calendars in use, and Jesus might have followed one of these calendars.

HUBER (2074c), pp. 120–121, comments on Antiquities 2. 313 in connection with the etymology of πάσχα–διάβασις.

I have not seen SAFRAI (2074d). [See *infra*, p. 944.]

HAAG (2074e), pp. 40–42, comments on Antiquities 2. 311–317 and other places in Josephus (Ant. 2. 316–317, 3. 248–251, 9. 271–272, 11. 109–110), where Josephus notes the various names by which Passover is cited.

PELLETIER (2074f) notes that the word for Passover (πάσχα) in Josephus is not hellenized but preserved intact from a very early tradition when Aramaic had already successfully resisted Hebrew.

PELLETIER (2074g), using the Septuagint, Josephus, and the papyri, concludes that the official calendar, including the names of the Sabbath (σάββατα) and of Passover (πάσχα), was not in the Hebrew of the Torah but in the Aramaic of the Elephantine Papyri and of the Targumim. Josephus' transcription of the names of the holidays thus corresponds exactly to those found in rabbinic writings.

CHENDERLIN (2074h) discusses the problem of the date of the Passover in the year of Jesus' death, and the apparent disagreement between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John. He asserts that Josephus gives us some useful indications. In particular, in his time the term 'Passover' could be used either of the fourteenth of Nisan until midnight or as an apparent synonym for that period plus the partially overlapping seven-day period beginning at sunset on the fourteenth – the period otherwise known as 'the Feast of the Unleavened Bread'. Inasmuch as Josephus (Ant. 3. 248–251) makes a distinction between the celebration of the paschal lamb and that of the Unleavened Bread, the acceptance of the term 'Passover' for the whole period of days leaves open the possibility that a double usage was current for phrases such as 'eat the Passover', which might apply to the other sacrifices of the week mentioned by Josephus, when it is clear from the context that they did not apply to the paschal lamb proper. For Josephus the 'first day of the Unleavened Bread' would have been the fifteenth of Nisan, that is, the first day of the partially overlapping seven-day period. The Mishnah, says CHENDERLIN, agrees that the term

'Passover' is ambiguous. The number of sacrificial paschal victims (CHENDERLIN accepts Josephus' figure as to the number of pilgrims) in this period would have constituted a pressing practical motive for a distributed observance of the festivities centering about those victims, that is, an observance distributed through several days or perhaps the whole week of Passover. We may, however, comment that the Torah (Exodus 12. 8–10) very specifically says that the paschal lamb must be eaten on the night of its sacrifice.

BOWMAN (2074i), pp. 38–40, comments on the celebration of Passover and Hanukkah according to Josephus.

COLPE (2075) correctly notes the error of LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES' Greek Lexicon, p. 1192, s.v. ξυλοφόριος, that the festival of the wood-carriers referred to in War 2. 425 (THACKERAY [2076], ad loc., incorrectly translates "the eighth day [read: the next day] was the feast of wood-carrying") is Tabernacles, inasmuch as Josephus (War 2. 430) says that the next day was the fifteenth of the month of Loos (i.e. Ab). COLPE tries to identify the festival with the fifteenth of Ab, which was, indeed (Mishnah, Ta'anith 4. 5), a day when the priests, Levites, and all those not certain of their tribal descent brought wood offerings for the sacrifices in the Temple. COLPE does not resolve the problem of the apparent discrepancy between Josephus, who seems to date the festival on the fourteenth of Ab, and the Mishnah, which dates it on the fifteenth. But we may note the fact that when Josephus refers to the festival (War 2. 425), he says τῇ δ' ἑξῆς, "on the next day," and again, when he says (War 2. 430) "on the next day, being the fifteenth day of the month Loos," he uses the same phrase (τῇ δ' ἑξῆς), so that we may perhaps infer that in War 2. 430 Josephus is simply recapitulating what he had said earlier in War 2. 425.

AALÉN (2077), p. 126, says that Josephus is unaware that the first of the month of Tishri is the festival of the New Year, and notes that in Antiquities 1. 81 he regards the first of Tishri as the New Year for "selling and buying and other ordinary affairs," whereas the first of Nisan is the beginning of the religious year. Josephus' distinction, we may note, is found in the Mishnah (Rosh Hashanah 1. 1), but we must add that he was surely aware of the religious dimension of 1 Tishri, since he cites (Ant. 3. 239) the special sacrifices of the day, as stated in the Torah (Numbers 29. 1–6). AALÉN is wrong in saying that Philo was unaware of 1 Tishri as a New Year's day, since he speaks (De Specialibus Legibus 1. 180) of it as "the beginning of the sacred month", notes its special sacrifices, and specifically states, in giving the reason for the number of calves (one) sacrificed, that "at the beginning of the year" the number one is preferable to the number two, since the latter is divisible.

EPSTEIN (2077a), pp. 347–348, notes that in one place (Ant. 3. 245) Josephus says that on Tabernacles the Jews are to bear the fruit of the περσέα, whereas elsewhere (Ant. 13. 372) he speaks of the fruit as a citron (κίτρινον). EPSTEIN concludes that Josephus is here using two different sources but admits that he felt no apparent contradiction. He suggests that perhaps in case they did not find a citron they could bring another type of fruit, inasmuch as the Bible does not specify the fruit but merely declares (Lev. 23. 40) that it should be "fruit of a goodly tree". We may comment that since we do not know precisely

what the *persea* was, it is not really possible to draw a conclusion in this matter.

RANKIN (2078), pp. 76–77, commenting on Antiquities 12. 325, justifies Josephus' name for the festival of Hanukkah, 'Lights'.

ZEITLIN (2079) compares Josephus with the Talmudic literature and concludes that his name for the festival, 'Lights', has a nationalistic and historical explanation rather than the miraculous explanation which was imparted to the festival by the rabbis (Shabbath 21 b) and which, he says, was a later innovation, together with the practice of lighting a menorah.

STEIN (2080) connects the phrase "in those days, in this time", which is part of the traditional formula of the liturgical service for Hanukkah, with Antiquities 12. 320–321, which states that the rededication of the Temple occurred on precisely the same day on which three years earlier the Temple had been defiled; but we may note that the phrase speaks of "those days" rather than "that day" and uses it in connection with the miracles which G-d wrought "in those days and in this time". It would, therefore, hardly be appropriate to speak of the day when the Temple was defiled as an indication of G-d's miracles; more likely the reference is to the miracles which G-d wrought then (at the rededication of the Temple) and continuously thereafter in later times.

DEL MEDICO (2081) cites Josephus (Ant. 11. 281–292 and 12. 316–325) and especially Josippon to substantiate his fantastic thesis that Purim and Hanukkah are parallel and correspond to the Roman festivals of the Saturnalia and Lupercalia, that behind Ahasuerus in the Purim story stands Julius Caesar, and that the two festivals were Judaized in the interests of Jewish religious unity and imposed by the Romans in their desire to unify religions in their vast Empire.

## 20.7: Sacrifices and Ritual Banquets

(2082) JACOB N. EPSTEIN: On the Terms of 'Naziriteship' (in Hebrew). In: Magnes Anniversary Book. Jerusalem 1938. Pp. 10–16.

(2083) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period. 13 vols. New York 1953–68.

EPSTEIN (2082) notes that the term *legaleah nazir* in the sense of bringing the sacrifices of Nazirites as found in Josephus (Ant. 19. 294) is paralleled in Acts 21. 24, I Maccabees 3. 49–50, and the Midrash (Sifre Numbers 35).

GOODENOUGH (2083), volume 6, p. 206, cites a decree of Julius Caesar (Ant. 14. 213–216) in which the Jews of Delos, unlike other religious societies (θῆσσοι), are permitted to hold their accustomed common meals, and argues that the fact that Caesar compares the Jews with other θῆσσοι shows that they constituted an organization for mystic celebrations. But, we may comment, the word θῆσσοι need not refer to mystic organizations; and when Caesar permits the Delian Jews to collect money for common meals (σύνδειπνα) there is no indication that these are of mystic significance; they may mean simply meals that Jews held in common or which they gave for poor people.

## 20.8: Idolatry

- (2084) JEAN-BAPTISTE FREY: La Question des images chez les Juifs à la lumière des récentes découvertes. In: *Biblica* 15, 1934, pp. 265–300.
- (2085) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. New York 1953–68.
- (2086) EDWYN BEVAN: *Holy Images: An Inquiry into Idolatry and Image-Worship in Ancient Paganism and in Christianity*. London 1940.
- (2087) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *Oriental Art in Roman Palestine* (*Studi Semitici*, vol. 5: Istituto di Studi del Vicino Oriente, Università di Roma, Centro di Studi Semitici). Rome 1961.
- (2088) MORTON SMITH: Goodenough's *Jewish Symbols* in Retrospect. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86, 1967, pp. 53–68.
- (2089) RUDOLF MEYER: Die Figurendarstellung in der Kunst des späthellenistischen Judentums. In: *Judaica* 5, 1949, pp. 1–40.
- (2090) CECIL ROTH: An Ordinance against Images in Jerusalem, A.D. 66. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 49, 1956, pp. 169–177.
- (2091) ARNOLD H. M. JONES: *The Herods of Judaea*. Oxford 1938.
- (2092) JOSEPH GUTMANN: The 'Second Commandment' and the Image in Judaism. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 32, 1961, pp. 161–174.
- (2093) PAUL L. MAIER: The Episode of the Golden Roman Shields at Jerusalem. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 62, 1969, pp. 109–121.
- (2093a) WERNER G. KÜMMEL: Die älteste religiöse Kunst der Juden. In: *Judaica* 2, 1946–47, pp. 1–56.
- (2093b) HARTWIG THYEN: *Der Stil der Jüdisch-Hellenistischen Homilie*. Diss., Marburg 1953. Publ. (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, n. F., 47. Heft, der ganzen Reihe 65. Heft): Göttingen 1955.
- (2093c) ARYE BEN-DAVID: *Jerusalem and Tyros. Ein Beitrag zur palästinensischen Münz- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (126 a. C.–57 p. C.). Basel-Tübingen 1969.
- (2093d) KURT SCHUBERT: Das Problem der Entstehung einer jüdischen Kunst im Lichte der literarischen Quellen des Judentums. In: *Kairos* 16, 1974, pp. 1–13.
- (2093e) WILLIAM H. C. FREND: The Persecutions: Some Links between Judaism and the Early Church. In: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 9, 1958, pp. 141–158. Rpt. in his: *Religion Popular and Unpopular in the Early Christian Centuries*. London 1976.

Josephus' attitude toward images seems more strict than the rabbinic tradition. He (Ant. 8. 195) goes out of his way to condemn King Solomon for breaking the Second Commandment in putting the images of bulls and lions in the Temple, whereas the Bible itself (I Kings 7. 25, 10. 20) does not censure him. In this attitude Josephus disagrees with the rabbinic tradition (Zevaḥim 62 b), which similarly does not condemn him.

FREY (2084), in his excellent review of the literary evidence, and especially Josephus, tries (pp. 274–275) to show that at the time of Josephus the Jews fanatically observed the stricter tradition with regard to images rather than the liberal view which restricted the prohibition merely to images which might be worshipped. We may reply that though the conclusions in GOODENOUGH's (2085) magnificent and epoch-making work have been subject to fierce debate, the accumulated evidence does indicate that there was widespread popular liberalism with regard to the attitude toward images throughout the Hellenistic period.

BEVAN (2086), pp. 48–49, says that the Jews in this period apparently understood the prohibition of images to apply to living creatures only and that this is implied by Josephus and borne out by the coins of the Hasmonean and Herodian kings, but that later the rabbis extended it to include all representations that purport to be images of G-d. We may, however, note that the Bible itself (Exodus 20. 3–5) seems to prohibit the images not only of living creatures but of anything that is in the heavens (i.e. heavenly bodies), as well as on the earth or in the seas. It is the later rabbis who restrict the application of this commandment, so that the Tosefta ('Avodah Zarah 5. 2) quotes Rabbi Eleazar ben Zadok of the end of the first century as saying that all the faces were in Jerusalem except only the human face, and the Talmud ('Avodah Zarah 44 b) remarks that Rabban Gamaliel II in the same period went to a bathhouse which contained a statue of Aphrodite.

AVI-YONAH (2087), pp. 13–27, convincingly concludes, on the basis of the survey of the extant art, that the traditional formulation of a strict polarization between Hellenism and Judaism during the Hellenistic-Roman period rests on a feeble foundation. He tries to explain the apparent discrepancy between the literary tradition as found in Josephus and the liberal position in the actual art by saying that Josephus expresses the view common in his time among the Pharisees and the masses, whereas the art was left by the Sadducean aristocrats; but, we may comment, this is an unlikely hypothesis since the Sadducees seem to have disappeared for practical purposes with the destruction of the Temple, and yet this 'liberal' approach to images in art continues. Moreover, the Sadducees were literalists in their interpretation of the Bible. The fact that the eagle is one of the common ornaments in Galilean synagogues and in the newly-excavated synagogue at Sardis can hardly be due to Sadducean influence. It would be easier to argue, though, this, too, is hardly convincing, since archaeological evidence before 70 is extremely limited, that the relative lack of decoration before 70 is due to the influence of the Sadducean aristocracy, which took Exodus 20. 3 literally, and that the increase of figures after 70 is a consequence of increasing Pharisaic, liberal influence.

SMITH (2088) criticizes GOODENOUGH (2085) for viewing the relative rarity of decorated material in Palestine before 70 as a consequence of the influence of the Pharisees, and the increase in decoration after 70 as evidence of the decline of this influence. SMITH rightly points out that archaeological evidence before 70 is extremely limited, and that the changes in Palestine are paralleled by developments in Roman art in which decoration steadily increased. He notes, moreover, that, despite the Talmud, such a work as the 'Sefer ha-Razim' (edited by MARGALIOTH) shows very considerable syncretism.

MEYER (2089), especially pp. 1–12, concludes that the iconoclasm by Jews depicted by Josephus in such passages as War. 1. 648–650 and Antiquities 17. 151, concerning the opposition to Herod's erection of a golden eagle over the Temple gates, does not reflect the view of all the Jewish people nor even of all Pharisaic circles. He says that such a position was held only in fanatical circles of the Pharisees; but, while we may note that GOODENOUGH's 'Symbols' supports MEYER's general position, the fact that Josephus, who is far from a

fanatic, condemns Solomon, as we have noted above, shows that it was not merely fanatics who upheld such a position.

Elsewhere (Life 65), we may note, Josephus justifies his going up to Tiberias by saying to the Jews of Galilee that he was going to lead them in destroying Herod the Tetrarch's palace because it had been profaned by being decorated with images of animals. We may assume that the animals were merely decorative, which in Talmudic law ('Avodah Zarah 43 b) is permitted, since, if merely decorative, only a human shape is halakhically forbidden. And yet, we may note, Josephus does not see fit to criticize the Jewish king Agrippa I, who had had statues of his daughters made (Ant. 19. 357), perhaps because of his friendship with Agrippa's son Agrippa II. Alternatively, we may suggest, drawing on contemporary analogies, there were many who officially held a stricter position but in practice were more lenient. We may suggest an analogy with the attitude toward the occult, which is clearly banned in all its aspects in the Bible (Deuteronomy 18. 10–11) and which yet in practice was tolerated by rabbis who practiced astrology (Shabbath 129 b) and magic (Sanhedrin 68 a) and permitted lucky charms (Shabbath 62 a).

ROTH (2090) postulates that it was the opposition of the rabbis to Herod's erection of the eagle in 4 B.C.E (War 1. 648–650, Ant. 17. 149–154) which became part of the Pharisaic code against images in 66 C.E.; but, we may respond, the discrepancy in time seems too great, and, in any case, such an incident should not be seen in isolation: surely as significant in explaining the passion leading to the ban was the bitter opposition to the introduction of imperial busts under Pilate (War 2. 169–174, Ant. 18. 55–59).

GOODENOUGH (2085), vol. 8, pp. 123–125, commenting on Herod's eagle, accepts JONES' (2091) thesis, p. 150, that the indignation of the Pharisees was quite fictitious and that they had trumped up legal objections as a pretext for attacking Herod. But, we may reply, there is no hint of political motives in Josephus, who, in fact, speaking in his own person, goes out of his way to declare that Herod's act was forbidden by the Torah, which, he says, prohibits images of any living creature.

GUTMANN (2092) discounts Josephus' statement that Jewish opposition to Roman images and military standards was due to the strict observance of the anti-iconic Second Commandment and imputes it rather to Jewish hatred of Rome's oppressive rule. But, as we have noted, even if archaeological evidence shows that there were some who did not object to images, the evidence of both Philo and Josephus indicates that there were zealous Jews (admittedly their view was not held by all or perhaps even by a majority) who were fierce in their iconoclasm; and Josephus' statements in his own person about images erected by Solomon and Herod show that he, in theory at least, sympathized with the stricter group. GUTMANN cites Antiquities 17. 164, where the Jewish leaders assert that Herod's golden eagle had been torn down without their knowledge, in support of his position that these leaders were not iconoclastic; but, we may comment, the context specifically states that they said this out of fear that Herod in his fury might avenge himself upon them.



The episode of the introduction of iconic images by Pilate into the Antonia in Jerusalem (War 2. 169–174, Ant. 18. 55–59) and of the aniconic shields (Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 299–305) has been discussed above. MAIER (2093) concludes that Josephus omits the episode recorded by Philo because there was no theological justification for the opposition to this action, and that the opposition was an extremely sensitive, hyper-orthodox reaction against an unpopular foreign government; but, as we have noted above, there was a segment of the populace, including Josephus himself, who took a strict view of the laws of images. We may add that the great Rabbi Akiva in the early second century (Mekhilta, Baḥodesh 6. 60–85) prohibited the representation of all animal creatures, heavenly bodies, and angels, as well as anything under the earth, including whatever is reflected in water.

KÜMMEL (2093a), p. 4, citing Apion 2. 75, contrasts the general observance by Jews of the prohibition of images during the first century with the violation of this prohibition during the second and later centuries. We may, however, comment that we have very little art from the first century and that it is dangerous to generalize.

THYEN (2093b), pp. 32–33, commenting on Apion 2. 75, remarks that the absolute prohibition of artistic representation was restricted to certain circles of Pharisees, whose zealotry Josephus defended. On the other hand, the symbols of animals and stars on the curtain of the Temple were not completely offensive to him (War 5. 214).

BEN-DAVID (2093c) attempts to explain how, despite the prohibition of artistic representation, the coins with their engravings could have been accepted into the Temple.

SCHUBERT (2093d) contrasts Josephus' strictness with the liberalism of the rabbis in the attitude toward artistic representation. We may comment that perhaps the rabbis' liberalism was due to the fact that the masses of the people were liberal in this matter despite all rulings, and the rabbis were realistic enough to recognize this, whereas Josephus, on the other hand, had no 'constituency' and could afford to maintain an unyielding posture.

FREND (2093e) notes that Josephus describes how, in the great crises of 40 and 66, thousands of Jews were prepared to die rather than to worship idols. Such a tendency was powerfully reinforced by the merging of the figure of the prophet with that of the martyr. He notes the similarity in the test applied to determine the identity of Jews and of Christians, namely whether they were willing to offer sacrifices.

## 20.9: Athletics (see also 14.10)

(2093f) M. LÄMMER: Griechische Wettkämpfe in Jerusalem und ihre politischen Hintergründe. In: *Kölner Beiträge zur Sportwissenschaft* 2, 1973, pp. 182–227.

(2093g) M. LÄMMER: Soziale und ökonomische Aspekte des ersten Gymnasiums in Jerusalem. In: *Histoire de l'éducation physique et du sport. Séminaire internationale du 11 au 14 juillet 1973 à Zürich. Documents*, vol. 1, Zürich 1973.

- (2093h) HAROLD A. HARRIS: Greek Athletics and the Jews (ed. by I. M. BARTON and A. J. BROTHERS, Trivium Special Publications, 3). Cardiff, Wales 1976. Pp. 29–50: The Evidence from the Historians, the Books of Maccabees and Josephus.
- (2093i) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: HAROLD A. HARRIS, Greek Athletics and the Jews. In: *Classical World* 70, 1976–77, pp. 74–75.

I have not seen LÄMMER (2093f), which, according to SCHRECKENBERG's supplement, discusses Antiquities 15. 267–279, or his sequel (2093g).

HARRIS (2093h), pp. 29–50, takes issue with the common assumption that Orthodox Jews stayed away from the games in Palestine and in the Diaspora. He notes that Josephus refers in passing to eight sports-buildings in Palestine and argues that there were hardly enough Gentiles there to fill them. I (2093i) have, however, commented that the fact that in 66, according to Josephus (War 2. 457), the Gentile inhabitants of Caesarea massacred 20,000 Jews would indicate a large non-Jewish population. Moreover, Josephus (War 2. 460) says that in retaliation the Jews killed immense numbers of non-Jewish inhabitants. In addition, there were many thousands of Roman troops on hand at all times to view contests. The Talmud, which Harris inexplicably ignores, inveighs ('Avodah Zarah 18 b) against those who attend stadia. Finally, HARRIS can cite no passage in Josephus and no inscription that explicitly states that Jews patronized stadia in Palestine after the abortive attempt in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes.

## 20.10: Attitude toward Foreign Cults

- (2094) ADOLF SCHLATTER: Das Verhältnis Israels zu den Völkern. In his: *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josefus*. Gütersloh 1932. Rpt. in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed., *Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84)*. Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 190–204.
- (2095) SAMUEL BELKIN: *Philo and the Oral Law*. Cambridge, Mass. 1940.
- (2096) GERHARD DELLING: Josephus und die heidnischen Religionen. In: *Klio* 43–45, 1965, pp. 263–269. Rpt. in: FERDINAND HAHN et al., edd., *Gerhard Delling, Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum*. Göttingen 1970. Pp. 45–52.
- (2097) HAIM COHN: Flavius Josephus as Historian of the Penal Laws. Lecture (unpublished) at Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 27 March 1972.
- (2098) NORMAN BENTWICH: *Josephus*. Philadelphia 1914. Rpt. Folcroft, Pennsylvania 1976.
- (2099) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: Oil and Pagan Defilement. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 61, 1970, pp. 63–75.
- (2100) STEVEN RISKIN: *The Halakhah in Josephus as Reflected in Against Apion and The Life*. Diss., M. A., Yeshiva University, New York 1970.
- (2100a) ELIAS J. BICKERMAN: The Altars of Gentiles. A Note on the Jewish 'ius sacrum'. In: *Revue Internationale des Droits et de l'Antiquité*, Ser. 3.5, 1958, pp. 137–164.
- (2100b) DAVID ROKEAH: *The Jews in the Pagan-Christian Polemic from Its Beginnings to the Emperor Julian*. Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1968. Summary in: *Immanuel* 2, 1973, pp. 61–67.
- (2100c) SHARON K. HEYOB: *The Cult of Isis among Women in the Graeco-Roman World (Études préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire romain, 51)*. Leiden 1975.

- (2100d) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: *Flavius Josephus and the Mysteries*. In: MAARTEN J. VERMASEREN, ed., *Studies in Hellenistic Religions (Études préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire romain, 78)*. Leiden 1979. Pp. 244–279.
- (2100e) JAVIER TEIXIDOR: *The Pagan God: Popular Religion in the Greco-Roman Near East* (Princeton, 1977).

SCHLATTER'S (2094) chapter is a classic survey of the topic.

Josephus (Ant. 4. 207) cites as a law the prohibition against blaspheming the gods of other peoples. In *Against Apion* 2. 237 he calls it a custom of our fathers not to revile the laws of others and adds that it is forbidden by Jewish law "to deride or blaspheme the gods recognized by others out of respect for the very word 'G-d'." Many commentators have noted that there is no such prohibition in the Bible, which, in fact (e.g. Leviticus 18. 3), does revile the laws of pagans and indeed commands the destruction of pagan altars (Deuteronomy 12. 2–3). The source of Josephus' statement is the Septuagint version of Exodus 22. 27, "Thou shalt not revile G-d," where the plural form of the word for G-d is rendered θεούς, "gods." Philo (*De Vita Mosis* 2. 205, *De Specialibus Legibus* 1. 53) draws the same conclusion from this passage and indeed gives (*De Vita Mosis* 2. 205) the same reason for the prohibition, namely the holiness attached to the very name of G-d. BELKIN (2095), pp. 22–25, however, argues that this agreement between Philo and Josephus does not prove dependence; but the fact that both Philo and Josephus give the same reason for the prohibition, together with other instances noted above of possible dependence, makes such a connection likely.

DELLING (2096) concludes that in the last analysis Josephus does not make concessions to other religions incompatible with his religious faith in monotheism despite his eagerness to win equal rights for Judaism. But, we may comment, the fact that Josephus goes counter to the Bible in prohibiting despoiling of heathen temples indicates his willingness to make such compromises.

COHN (2097) says that Josephus' motive was apologetic since he goes further than Philo in specifically prohibiting despoiling foreign temples. In view of the fact, we may comment, that Josephus knew the Hebrew original, his choice of the Septuagint version, indeed, does appear to be deliberate for apologetic reasons.

BENTWICH (2098), p. 151, argues that when there is no other source for Josephus' deviations from rabbinic Halakhah he took the Roman laws as his source; but such a theory will not work here since there was no prohibition of this sort in Roman law at Josephus' time.

HOENIG (2099) challenges the view that the prohibition of using heathen oil mentioned in the Talmud (Shabbath 17 b) was a re-enactment of earlier prohibitions such as are mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 12. 120 and elsewhere) and stresses that the instances cited from Josephus all refer to Jews in the Diaspora. HOENIG says that the reason for the prohibition was that Grecian oil was a token of idolatry; if so, we may respond, it was no less idolatrous in the land of Israel, where there were many Greeks, than without.

Josephus (Life 113) tells of two non-Jewish nobles who had taken refuge with him while he was commander in Galilee and whom the Jews wished to compel to be circumcised as a condition of residence among them. Josephus then says that he successfully opposed such compulsion on the ground that one should be permitted to worship G-d in accordance with one's conscience. RISKIN (2100) quotes Rabbi Nehemiah (Yevamoth 24 b) as holding a position like that of Josephus, for he, too, says that forced conversion is not valid. The problem is to explain the position of the Jews of Galilee. RISKIN suggests that perhaps Josephus refers to the *ger toshav* (resident alien), but we may comment that a *ger toshav*, as uncircumcised, is expressly differentiated from a circumcised proselyte. We may suggest that the Galilaeans are reflecting the zeal of the Maccabees, who forcibly circumcised the inhabitants of the land of Israel on the ground that G-d's soil should be populated by G-d's people.

BICKERMAN (2100a), commenting on War 7. 45, notes that the Jews sometimes called their local synagogues temples to put them on a par with the pagan sanctuaries in the city.

ROKEAH (2100b) illustrates how Josephus served the Christians as a model, especially in his attack on pagan mythology and in the question of the antiquity of the nation.

HEYOB (2100c), pp. 115 and 117–119, questions the veracity of the story of Paulina as told by Josephus (Ant. 18. 65–80). She remarks that the gullibility of Paulina was surpassed only by that of her husband, who, knowing her intention to have relations with Anubis, nevertheless permitted her to go to the temple of Isis. Furthermore, the punishment dealt to Mundus, who had used this device to satisfy his love for Paulina, and the reason for its lack of severity, namely that it was a crime that grew out of passion, are out of harmony with the punishments meted out to the other conspirators and with the general policy of Tiberius. Finally, the other two authors, Tacitus (Ann. 2. 85. 5) and Suetonius (Tiberius 36), who record the incident omit any mention of the Paulina affair as the cause of the exile of the Egyptians and the Jews. All in all, the story resembles a Hellenistic romance. Moreover, the account has an apologetic tone to it by which Josephus intended to draw a distinction between the Oriental and Jewish religions, which were so often confused by the Roman authorities. We may comment that there is no necessary contradiction between the account of Josephus and those of Tacitus and Suetonius. The common denominator is that the reason for the expulsion of the Jews and of the Egyptians was their success in missionary activities; Josephus, with his penchant for the erotic, has focussed upon such an incident as that of Paulina to illustrate this.

VAN UNNIK (2100d) also argues that the story of Paulina (Ant. 18. 65–80) was inserted by Josephus for apologetic purposes.

TEIXIDOR (2100e), pp. 19–60, cites Josephus' statements (notably Ant. 8. 146 and Apion 1. 118–119) concerning Phoenician and Syrian divinities. He also comments, pp. 62–99, on Josephus' remarks concerning North Arabian deities, in particular the statement (Ant. 15. 253) that the ancestor of Costobarus, the governor of Idumaea and Gaza during the reign of Herod, had been a priest of Koze. In reporting this, Josephus is not misspelling the name of

Qos but rather is giving the god's name as it was known in Idumaea and where, under Nabataean influence, it was identified with Quzah, the North Arabian mountain and weather god.

### 20.11: Attitude toward Other Philosophies

- (2101) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: An Attack on the Epicureans by Flavius Josephus. In: WILLEM DEN BOER et al., edd., *Romanitas et Christianitas: studia Iano Henrico Waszink a. d. VI Kal. Nov. a. MCMXXIII XIII lustra complenti oblata*. Amsterdam 1973. Pp. 341–355.
- (2101a) BIRGER GERHARDSSON: Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity. Trans. by ERIC J. SHARPE (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, 22; originally diss., Uppsala). Uppsala 1961.
- (2101b) M. SWAN: A Consular Epicurean under the Early Principate. In: *Phoenix* 30, 1976, pp. 54–60.

VAN UNNIK (2101) notes that Josephus' attack on Epicureanism (Ant. 10. 277–281), while presenting some traditional arguments, is original in its views about Providence and constitutes an indication of the widespread diffusion of Epicurean doctrines in the Roman Empire. Such a study constitutes an attack upon the views of those who claim that Josephus was merely copying handbooks and repeating commonplaces. We must, however, remark that inasmuch as almost all of our sources for Epicureanism are lost it seems premature to conclude that Josephus is original.

GERHARDSSON (2101a), pp. 89 and 103ff., comments that when Josephus refers to Jewish wise men as σοφισταί, it is not as remote as we are inclined to believe, since communication and influence did take place. Thus this is not merely an indication of his tendency to present material in Hellenistic categories.

SWAN (2101b) conjectures that the Epicurean Pompedius mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 19. 32–36) may be P. Pomponius Secundus (PIR<sup>1</sup> P 563), consul suffectus in 44, legate of Upper Germany and tragic poet. Πομπήδιος should read Πομπώνιος (cf. the Excerpta of Dio Cassius, 59. 26. 4). His Epicurean affinities and unique public career appear in Tacitus (*Annals* 5. 8), who says that Pomponius endured his troubles with equanimity, *aequus* being an Epicurean rather than a Stoic term.

### 20.12: Law of Persons: Slavery, Charity, Marriage, Abortion, Divorce

- (2102) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: Halakhot regarding Slavery as a Source for the Social History of the Second Temple and the Talmudic Period (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 25, 1960, pp. 141–189.
- (2103) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Slavery during the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaitic Period. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 53, 1962–63, pp. 185–218.
- (2104) SALO W. BARON: *The Jewish Community: Its History and Structure to the American Revolution*. 3 vols. Philadelphia 1942.

- (2105) STEVEN RISKIN: The Halakhah in Josephus as Reflected in *Against Apion* and *The Life*. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York 1970.
- (2106) LOUIS M. EPSTEIN: Marriage Laws in the Bible and the Talmud. Cambridge, Mass. 1942; rpt. New York 1968.
- (2107) SAMUEL BELKIN: Levirate and Agnate Marriage in Rabbinic and Cognate Literature. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 60, 1969–70, pp. 275–329.
- (2107a) GERHARD KITTEL: Das Konnubium mit den Nichtjuden im antiken Judentum. In: *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg) 2, 1937, pp. 30–62.
- (2107b) BOAZ COHEN: Civil Bondage in Jewish and Roman Law. In: Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Vol. on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday. New York 1945. Pp. 113–132. Rpt. in his: *Jewish and Roman Law: A Comparative Study*. New York 1966. Vol. 1, pp. 159–178.
- (2107c) BOAZ COHEN: Some Remarks on the Law of Persons in Jewish and Roman Jurisprudence. In: *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 16, 1946–47, pp. 1–37. Rpt. in his: *Jewish and Roman Law: A Comparative Study*. New York 1966. Vol. 1, pp. 122–158.
- (2107d) RAMON SUGRANYES DE FRANCH: Études sur le droit palestinien à l'époque évangélique. La contrainte par corps. Fribourg 1946.
- (2107e) DAVID DAUBE: *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London 1956.
- (2107f) GEZA VERMES: The Qumran Interpretation of Scripture in Its Historical Setting. In: *Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society* 6, 1966–68, pp. 85–97.

Josephus (Ant. 4. 272) says that if a thief could not pay a fine, he was sold into slavery, whereas the Talmud limits the period of enslavement to covering the amount stolen. URBACH (2102) and ZEITLIN (2103), noting contradictions between the laws concerning slavery in Josephus and in the Talmud (Kiddushin 18a), conclude that Josephus reflects an earlier period. We may, however, suggest that Josephus may be following a point of view different from and not necessarily later than that adopted in the Talmud; as we have often noted above, the authority of the rabbis was less than supreme even in the land of Israel.

BARON (2104), especially volume 3, pp. 25–26, shows Josephus' Hellenization in his formulation of the law of charity.

Josephus (Against Apion 2. 199) says that sexual intercourse is permitted only if designed for procreation of children; but the Mishnah, recognizing that mere companionship is a purpose of marriage, permits a man to marry a woman incapable of bearing children if he had already fulfilled the commandment "Be fruitful and multiply" (Yevamoth 6. 6–7). RISKIN (2105) thinks that perhaps Josephus was influenced by the Essenes; but we may suggest that perhaps he was influenced by Philo's statement (De Vita Mosis 1. 28) that Moses participated in sexual relations solely to beget children.

Again, Josephus (Against Apion 2. 200) says that the law commands Jews not to be influenced by a dowry, whereas there is no such command in the Bible or in the Talmud, though the Talmud (Kiddushin 70a) warns that whoever marries a woman for her money will have disreputable children. RISKIN (2105) comments that Josephus is here combining imperative and counsel; we may suggest that the verb κελεύει ("orders") often means no more than "bids", "urges".

EPSTEIN (2106) concludes that Josephus (Ant. 4. 254), in speaking of the duty of levirate marriage of a woman who is left childless, rather than as

Deuteronomy 25. 5 has it, without a son, is following not the Pharisaic tradition but the Septuagint, which thus renders the passage.

BELKIN (2107) notes that Josephus (Ant. 4. 254), in saying that the son born of a levirate marriage is the heir to the estate, contradicts rabbinic law (Mishnah, Yevamoth 4. 7), which names the levir as the heir, but that he is akin to the rabbis in stressing the welfare of the widow and family solidarity – qualities, we may comment, which are important in the Biblical text itself. BELKIN also cites Josephus' statement (Ant. 4. 175) that if the daughters of Zelophehad married into another tribe the inheritance would be left in their father's tribe, which, he says, is in contradiction to the Talmud, which declares that property would be passed on to the son or husband. Here, we may comment, the rabbis themselves (Sifra Emor on Leviticus 22. 3) declare that the Biblical law (Numbers 38. 10) to marry within the father's family applied only when the land was divided according to tribes; and Josephus' statement declares merely that at the time of Zelophehad's daughters it was so ordained that the heritage should remain in the tribe; presumably, once the tribes ceased to be, as was the case in Josephus' own day, the rule was no longer in force.

Josephus (Against Apion 2. 202) equates abortion with infanticide, whereas, as RISKIN (2105) points out, the Mishnah (Niddah 5. 3) does not regard the unborn foetus as a human being or 'complete soul' and indeed is killed to save the mother if the majority of the foetus has not emerged. RISKIN cites the Septuagint on Exodus 21. 22–23 as supporting Josephus, but the Septuagint says that only if the embryo was perfectly formed (i. e. a fully viable child) is there a death penalty. Philo (De Specialibus Legibus 3. 108–109) similarly understands the Septuagint. The Talmud apparently goes further and inflicts the death penalty not when the embryo has been fully formed but when the majority of it has emerged from the womb. RISKIN says that Josephus did not want to let it appear that Jewish law was more lenient than the law applicable to non-Jews, since the Talmud (Sanhedrin 57b) quotes Rabbi Ishmael as stating that Noahide law forbids killing a foetus in its mother's womb on the basis of an interpretation of Genesis 9. 6: "One who sheds the blood of man in man, his blood shall be shed". Similarly, says RISKIN, Josephus was motivated by a desire not to be more lenient than Plato, who says (ap. Plutarch, De Placitis Philosophorum 5. 15) that a foetus is a living being. But, we may reply, the rabbis (Yevamoth 62b) deduced its prohibition *a fortiori* from the laws against onanism or having sexual relations with one's wife when likely to harm the foetus. The fact that they call the perpetrator of such an abortion "a shedder of blood" corresponds to Josephus' appellation for the perpetrator as an infanticide who "destroys a soul".

KITTEL (2107a), in an article unfortunately marred by anti-Semitism, discusses Josephus as a source for intermarriage.

COHEN (2107b) notes that Josephus assumed that in Jewish law, as in Roman jurisprudence, a person may be reduced to penal slavery for committing a capital offense.

COHEN (2107c) comments on the position of the freedman in Jewish society, apart from his legal status, in the light of Josephus' evidence (Ant. 18.

167, pertaining to Thallus, a freedman, and War 1. 582–585 and 1. 601, and Ant. 17. 146).

SUGRANYES DE FRANCH (2107d), pp. 82–83, comments on the legal status of Jewish slaves (Ant. 3. 282, 16. 1–5).

DAUBE (2107e), pp. 369–372, discusses Josephus' multitude of terms for divorce. He draws no conclusion, but we may comment that Josephus is not a legalist in his imprecise use of terms.

VERMES (2107f), p. 88, comments on Antiquities 1. 151 concerning the union of uncle and niece.

### 20.13: Theft, Kidnapping, Agency

- (2108) LUITPOLD WALLACH: Alexander the Great and the Indian Gymnosophists in Hebrew Tradition. In: Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research 11, 1941, pp. 47–83.
- (2109) ASHER GULAK: The Law of King Herod on the Punishment of Thieves. In: HARRY TORCZYNER, ed., *Sefer Joseph Klausner*. Tel-Aviv 1937. Pp. 132–135.
- (2110) JOSHUA GUTMAN: The Order of Herod against the Thieves Caught Breaking in (in Hebrew). In: EMANUEL BIN GORION, ed., *Sefer Shmuel A. Horodetzky*. Tel-Aviv 1947. Pp. 59–66.
- (2111) JOSHUA GUTMAN: Bodily Servitude of a Man for His Debts in the Law of Israel (in Hebrew). In: YITZHAK BAER, JOSHUA GUTMAN, and MOSHE SCHWABE, edd., *Sefer Ben Zion Dinaburg*. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 68–82.
- (2112) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Slavery during the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaitic Period. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 53, 1962–63, pp. 185–218.
- (2113) ABRAHAM SCHAT: King Herod, the Man and His Work (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1960. Trans. into German by JOSHUA AMIR: *König Herodes, Der Mann und sein Werk*. Berlin 1968.
- (2114) HAIM COHN: Flavius Josephus as Historian of the Penal Laws (in Hebrew). Unpublished lecture, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 27 March 1972.
- (2115) STEVEN RISKIN: The Halakhah in Josephus as Reflected in *Against Apion* and *The Life*. Diss., M. A., Yeshiva University, New York 1970.
- (2116) AARON KIRSCHENBAUM: Studies in Agency for a Sinful Deed: II (in Hebrew). In: *Yearbook of Jewish Law* 1, Jerusalem 1974, pp. 219–230.
- (2116a) BOAZ COHEN: Civil Bondage in Jewish and Roman Law. In: Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Vol. on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday. New York 1945. Pp. 113–132. Rpt. in his: *Jewish and Roman Law: A Comparative Study*. New York 1966. Vol. 1, pp. 159–178.
- (2116b) ARNOLD EHRHARDT: Parakatatheke. In: *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte. Romanistische Abteilung* 75, 1958, pp. 32–90.
- (2116c) BERNARD S. JACKSON: Theft in Early Jewish Law (revised version of his thesis, Oxford 1969). Oxford 1972.

WALLACH (2108), pp. 70–71, concludes that Josephus' formulation of the law (*Against Apion* 2. 208, 216) with regard to appropriating the goods of others is in a Hellenized form and only incidentally follows the Biblical passage (Leviticus 5. 21), since Josephus' aim is apologetic and he is writing for Greek readers. Josephus' aim, he says, was to show the Greeks that the Jewish laws were



like theirs. But, we may comment, Josephus often goes out of his way in 'Against Apion' to cite contrasts between Jewish and Greek law.

GULAK (2109) notes the discrepancy cited by Josephus (Ant. 16. 1–5) between the Torah, which states that a thief is to be sold as a Hebrew slave for six years, and Herod's law, which declared that he was to sold forever and abroad as a non-Jew. It would seem surprising that Herod would risk offending the sensibilities of his subjects on such a matter, but GULAK finds a hint of such a law in the Midrash Halakhah (Mekhilta Mishpatim 13). The parallel that he cites in the Twelve Tables declaring that a thief is to be sold across the Tiber is closer, though Josephus is more strict than either the Torah or Roman law.

GUTMAN (2110), commenting on the fourfold payment by thieves imposed by Herod (Ant. 16. 3), notes parallels with Plato (Gorgias 477A and Laws 9. 854D–E), Protagoras, and Aristotle.

GUTMAN (2111), commenting on Antiquities 16. 1–5 on the punishment of thieves entering secretly, shows that Josephus' language regarding the punishment is fully Hellenized.

ZEITLIN (2112) resolves the contradiction between Josephus and the Talmud on the question of the enslavement of a thief who cannot pay the principal and the fine by stating that the Talmudic law is of a later period. He disagrees with SCHALIT's (2113) defence, pp. 124–132, of Herod in selling thieves into slavery outside Palestine as based on Roman law, since, as he rightly notes, it is against the spirit of Jewish law.

COHN (2114) says that Josephus (Ant. 4. 271) contradicts himself in prescribing a death penalty for thieves but a money penalty for the stealer of gold or silver, and notes the difference with Philo and the possible influence of the Twelve Tables. We may respond, however, that Josephus specifies the death penalty for stealing of a person. There is, to be sure, a difference with Talmudic tradition (Mishnah, Sanhedrin 10. 2), which ordains a death penalty only if the kidnapper sells his victim into slavery, since the Biblical text (Exodus 21. 16) says: "And he that steals a man and sells him". It is interesting, as RISKIN (2115) notes, that the Karaites, who generally are literalists, agree with Josephus in understanding the text to mean "or if he will".

KIRSCHENBAUM (2116) comments on Herod's trial (Ant. 14. 168–184; War 1. 210–211) for having killed Ezekiel, a bandit leader, and his followers (Ant. 14. 159) without due process and notes that in Josephus Samaias berates the Sanhedrin for allowing itself to be overawed by Herod's appearance with his troops. He rightly dismisses as irrelevant an alleged parallel in the Talmud (Kiddushin 43a): "If one says to his agent 'Go forth and slay a soul', the latter is liable, and his sender is exempt. Shammai the Elder said on the authority of Haggai the Prophet: 'His sender is liable'". As KIRSCHENBAUM notes, in Josephus Samaias' accusation is that Herod killed men without a trial and there is no question of agency. There is no statement in Josephus that Herod ordered his soldiers to kill the bandits.

COHEN (2116a) notes that Josephus (Ant. 4. 272) says that the thief, if unable to pay, should become a servant to the aggrieved party. Since this statement is to be found in neither the Bible nor the Talmud, COHEN suggests that

Josephus is interpreting Jewish law so as to bring it into harmony with Roman law. As to Josephus' remark (*ibid.*) that those who steal cattle make fourfold compensation in Jewish law, whereas actually in Jewish law this applies only to those who steal and kill or sell them, COHEN explains that Josephus was here offering his own interpretation of Scripture. Again, Josephus' statement (Ant. 16. 1) that Herod's enactment that housebreakers be sold as slaves to foreigners is not consonant with Jewish law. Very probably, COHEN explains, Herod was partly inspired by a Roman rule in his vigorous attempt to halt burglary; however, Herod went further in selling burglars to foreign slavery.

EHRHARDT (2116b) discusses Josephus' presentation (Ant. 4. 285–286) of the law of deposits (Ex. 32: 6–7). He concludes that Josephus did not use the Septuagint here, but that both he and Philo (De Specialibus Legibus 4. 30–31) used a common source, inasmuch as their language is so similar.

JACKSON (2116c), pp. 33–35, notes that the activities of the ληστής appear with some consistency in the Septuagint, Philo, Josephus, and Tannaitic literature; but in some passages in Josephus (e. g., Ant. 20. 210, War 4. 405) the λησταί are clearly Sicarii. He notes (pp. 77–78) that Biblical law did not restrict the offense of sacrilege to theft from a sacred site, as was the case in Greek, Roman, and Hellenistic law. Such a distinction is reflected in some passages in Josephus (Ant. 16. 163–164, 167–168) but does not appear to have entered the mainstream of Jewish law, though Antiquities 17. 163 indicates that the offense of sacrilege did not require retention of the sacred property or benefit to the offenders. JACKSON notes that JUSTER interpreted War 2. 228–229 as implying that the Jewish authorities had the duty to punish brigands, but that this interpretation goes beyond what the text states; and, indeed, a rabbinic source (Pesikta de-Rav Kahana 159b) confirms Josephus' evidence that jurisdiction over brigandage belonged to the Romans. As to War 2. 253, which indicates that the procurator Albinus sent brigands to Rome, JACKSON explains that they were not Roman citizens, who had the right of appeal, and that they were sent to participate in a triumph or to undergo punishment of some other nature. We may comment that the word ἀναπέμπω, which THACKERAY, in the Loeb translation (ad loc.), says means “to send for trial”, does not have this meaning in many of the passages cited in RENGSTORF's concordance (e. g. War 2. 451, 558, 630, etc.).

## 20.14: Suicide

- (2117) JOHANNES LEIPOLDT: Der Tod bei Griechen und Juden. Leipzig 1942.
- (2118) SAUL LIEBERMAN: Some Aspects of After Life in Early Rabbinic Literature. In: SAUL LIEBERMAN et al., edd., Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume, English section, vol. 2. Jerusalem 1965. Pp. 495–532. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed., Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature. New York 1977. Pp. 387–424.
- (2119) DAVID DAUBE: Josephus on Suicide and Liability of Deposittee. In: Libro Jubilar de Victor Andrés Belaúnde, Mercurio Peruano. Lima 1963. Pp. 231–241. Rpt. in: Juridical Review 9, Edinburgh 1964, pp. 212–224.

- (2120) LEON D. HANKOFF: *The Concept of Suicide in the Life and Works of Flavius Josephus* (unpublished). 1974. (Available from the author at Misericordia Hospital, Bronx, New York).
- (2120a) LEON D. HANKOFF: *The Theme of Suicide in the Works of Flavius Josephus*. In: *Clio Medica* 11, 1976, pp. 15–24.
- (2120b) LEON D. HANKOFF: *Flavius Josephus: First-century A.D. View of Suicide*. In: *New York State Journal of Medicine* 77, 1977, pp. 1986–1992.
- (2120c) LEON D. HANKOFF: *Flavius Josephus: Suicide and Transition*. In: *New York State Journal of Medicine* 79, 1979, pp. 937–942.
- (2120d) SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN: *Suicide in Biblical, Exegetical and Rabbinical Literature*. Diss., Yeshiva University, New York 1978.

LEIPOLDT (2117), pp. 35–37, discusses superficially the suicide of Phasael (Ant. 14.367, 15.12–13), the speeches favoring suicide by Eleazar at Masada (War 7.320–388), and Josephus' speech (War 3.361–382) at Jotapata opposing suicide. While noting Josephus' use of Plato and the Stoics, he concludes that though Josephus' comrades took offense at his arguments, the majority of the Greeks judged differently, and that Josephus' conclusions were far removed from the Jewish way. We may note, however, that Jewish thought agrees with Josephus in strong opposition to suicide. The Talmud (Semahoth 2.1) declares that no rites are to be performed in honor of one who has knowingly killed himself. LIEBERMAN (2118), pp. 513–516, cites Genesis Rabbah 34.13 and 'Avodah Zarah 18a in stressing the strong Jewish opposition to suicide or to hastening one's death.

DAUBE (2119) cites War 3.371–374, where Josephus, in his speech against suicide at Jotapata, says that the soul is a deposit from G-d, to support his view that in the earlier Tannaitic period (the first two centuries) the liability of a depositor was limited to fraud and was not extended to negligence. But, we may comment, DAUBE himself acknowledges that at least his opening exhortation to guard the deposit, that is the soul, as if it were a sacred nature, involves more than abstention from fraud.

HANKOFF (2120), a psychiatrist, has a comprehensive summary of twenty-two committed or attempted suicides described by Josephus. He concludes that Josephus' writings reflect his preoccupation, consciously and subconsciously, with and value judgments on suicide and show a clinician's astuteness regarding all aspects of suicidal behavior and ideation. The Jotapata suicide pact, he says, contains a rebirth fantasy for Josephus, since the number of those in the cave at Jotapata with Josephus, forty, represents a new beginning in the Bible. HANKOFF notes a parallel between the scene at Jotapata and the suicide of the old bandit (War 1.312–313, Ant. 14.429–430) who killed his wife and children rather than allow them to slip through to the enemy; this, we may suggest, may be because the theme is typological and does not conform to actual facts.

HANKOFF (2120a) presents a systematic discussion, from a psychiatric point of view, of the twenty-three successful and four unsuccessful attempts at suicide recorded in Josephus. He notes the relative paucity of unsuccessful suicide attempts as compared with fatalities. He explains the relative paucity of suicides

by females as compared with modern statistics as due to the fact that women are seldom central characters in history as Josephus recorded it.

HANKOFF (2120b) notes that in Josephus suicide is a natural extension of defeat in battle. A variety of painful methods are used, though the weapon of war, the sword, is most often employed. We may comment that the reason for this presumably is that Josephus is a political and military historian and hence his suicides are generally those of political and military figures. Josephus, of course, as a good Jew, condemns suicide, as HANKOFF notes; and even in the case of the heroes of Masada he himself does not express admiration for their suicide but rather attributes this feeling to the Roman soldiers. He remarks that Josephus' detailed reporting of suicides was probably accurate to a considerable degree and enhanced by his own phobic concern for that fate. We may, however, suggest that inasmuch as Josephus himself refused to share the suicides of his men at Jotapata he may well have been unduly obsessed with guilt and may thus have devoted undue attention to suicides.

HANKOFF (2120c) deals with the mass suicides at Scythopolis (War 2. 469–476), Jotapata (War 3. 340–391), and Masada (War 7. 304–401), noting the standardized plots in Josephus' accounts.

GOLDSTEIN (2120d), p. 77, presents a cursory analysis, from an Halakhic point of view, of Josephus' references to the suicide at Masada.

## 20.15: Treatment of Animals

(2121) SAMUEL BELKIN: *The Alexandrian Source for Contra Apionem II*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 27, 1936–37, pp. 1–32. Rpt. in expanded form: *The Alexandrian Halakah in Apologetic Literature of the First Century C.E.* New York 1936.

(2122) STEVEN RISKIN: *The Halakhah in Josephus as Reflected in Against Apion and The Life*. Diss., M. A., Yeshiva University, New York 1970.

Josephus (Against Apion 2. 213) writes that the Jew is forbidden to kill an animal which takes refuge in his house as a suppliant, but the Bible knows no such prohibition. BELKIN (2121) cites a parallel in Philo's *Hypothetica* 7. 9, which states that one should not destroy animals when they seek to take refuge in one's house as suppliants. The parallel in language (Philo: ἱκεσίαν . . . προσφευγόντων ἀναίρειν; Josephus: ἱκετεύοντα προσφεύγει . . . ἀνελεῖν) is indeed striking, and suggests borrowing and not merely a case of humane treatment of animals, as RISKIN (2122) argues.

Josephus (Against Apion 2. 214) also declares that the law bids the Jew, even in an enemy's country, to spare and not kill beasts employed in labor. RISKIN, who notes that there is no such law in the Bible or Talmud, thinks that perhaps Josephus deduced this from the prohibition against destroying the enemy's fruit trees (Deuteronomy 20. 19); but we may suggest that what Josephus may have in mind is the law (Exodus 23. 4–5) that states that if one sees one's enemy's animal gone astray one should return it to him, and that similarly one should assist one's enemy's animal in distress.

Josephus' statement (Against Apion 2. 271) that castration of an animal is a capital crime has no basis in the Bible, which merely forbids offering a castrated animal (Leviticus 22. 24), or in the Talmud (Ḥagigah 14b), which forbids castration of animals in general. RISKIN suggests that Josephus is merely emphasizing the severity of the crime, but we may suggest that inasmuch as the Bible does not specify the punishment, Josephus may reflect a tradition, earlier or divergent, that the proper punishment is death.

## 21: Religious Movements: The Samaritans

### 21.0: Religious Movements: the Samaritans: Josephus as a Source

- (2123) LEO A. MAYER: *Bibliography of the Samaritans*, ed. by Donald Broadribb (Supplements to *Abr-Nahrain* I, ed. by JOHN BOWMAN). Leiden 1964. Revision of: *Outline of a Bibliography of the Samaritans* (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 4, 1956, pp. 252–268.
- (2124) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Selected Literature on the Samaritans* (Ant. xviii. 29–30, 85–87, etc. Appendix F. In: *Josephus*, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books xviii–xx (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. P. 565.
- (2125) RAPHAEL WEISS, ed.: *Select Bibliography on the Samaritans* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1969; 2nd ed., 1970; 3rd ed., 1974.
- (2125a) SERGIO NOJA: *Contribution à la bibliographie des Samaritains*. In: *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 33, 1973, pp. 98–113.
- (2125b) JEAN MARGAIN: *Éléments de Bibliographie Samaritaine*. In: *Semitica* 27, 1977, pp. 153–157.
- (2125c) RAPHAEL WEISS: *Supplements to the Samaritan Bibliography*. In: *Annali dell'Istituto Orientale di Napoli* 35, 1975, pp. 265–273.
- (2125d) MENACHEM MOR: *More Bibliography on the Samaritans* (with Emphasis on Samaritanism and Christianity). In: *Henoch* 1, 1979, pp. 99–122.
- (2126) JAMES A. MONTGOMERY: *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology, and Literature*. Philadelphia 1907; rpt. New York 1968.
- (2127) WARREN J. MOULTON: *Samaritans*. In: JAMES HASTINGS, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* 11, 1920, pp. 161–167.
- (2128) MOSES GASTER: *The Samaritans: Their History, Doctrines, and Literature*. London 1925.
- (2129) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: *Storia d'Israele*. 4th ed., Torino 1947. Trans. into French by PAUL AUVRAY: *Histoire d'Israël*. 2 vols. Paris 1939. Trans into English by CLEMENT DELLA PENTA and RICHARD T. A. MURPHY: *The History of Israel*. 2 vols. Milwaukee 1955. Trans. into German by KONSTANZ FASCHIAN: *Geschichte Israels*. Wien 1955. Trans. into Polish: *Dzieje Izraela*. Warsaw 1956. Trans into Spanish: *Historia de Israel*. Barcelona 1945.
- (2130) ABRAM SPIRO: *Samaritans, Tobiads, and Judaites in Pseudo-Philo*. In: *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 20, 1951, pp. 279–355.
- (2131) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: *Josephus*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (2132) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Prolegomenon*. In reissue of: MONTAGUE R. JAMES, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. New York 1971. Pp. vii–clxix.
- (2133) ANDRÉ PARROT: *Samarie; capitale du royaume d'Israël* (*Cahiers d'archéologie biblique*, no. 7). Neuchâtel 1955. Trans. into English by SAMUEL H. HOOKE: *Samaria, the Capital of the Kingdom of Israel* (*Studies in Biblical Archaeology*, no. 7). New York 1955.
- (2134) JOHN BOWMAN: *Samaritanische Probleme. Studien zum Verhältnis von Samaritanertum, Judentum und Urchristentum*. Franz Delitzsch-Vorlesungen 1959. Stuttgart 1967. Trans. into English: *Samaritan Problems*. Pittsburgh 1975.

- (2135) PETER R. ACKROYD: *Exile and Restoration; a Study of Hebrew Thought of the Sixth Century B.C.* London 1968.
- (2136) F. ZAYADINE: *La Samarie hellénistique et romaine*: In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 121, 1970, pp. 3–5.
- (2137) CAROLYN OSIEK and ED. REWOLINSKI: *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum Pseudo-Philonis: The Joshua Narrative xx–xxiv*. In: *New Testament Seminar of Prof. JOHN STRUGNELL*, Harvard Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. Fall 1971. No. 3. Unpublished.
- (2138) MORTON SMITH: *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament*. New York 1971.
- (2139) ALBRECHT ALT: *Die Rolle Samarias bei der Entstehung des Judentums*. In: *Festschrift Otto Proksch zum 60. Geburtstag*. Leipzig 1934. Pp. 5–28.
- (2139a) GERHARD KITTEL: *Das Konnubium mit den Nichtjuden im antiken Judentum*. In: *Forschungen zur Judenfrage* (Hamburg) 2, 1937, pp. 30–62.
- (2139b) THEODOR H. GASTER: *Samaritans*. In: GEORGE A. BUTTRICK, ed., *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 4, Nashville 1962, pp. 190–197.
- (2139c) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: *Die Samaritaner*. In his: *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu, Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*. Leipzig 1923; 3rd ed., Göttingen 1962. Trans. into French (based on 3rd ed.) by JEAN LEMOYNE: *Jérusalem au temps de Jésus, recherches d'histoire économique et sociale pour la période néotestamentaire*. Paris 1967. Trans. into English (based on 3rd ed.) by F. H. and C. H. CAVE: *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus; An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Philadelphia 1969.
- (2139d) GEORGE E. WRIGHT: *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City*. New York 1964; London 1965.
- (2139e) GEORGE E. WRIGHT: *The Samaritans at Shechem*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 55, 1962, pp. 357–366.
- (2139f) JOHN MACDONALD: *Samaritans: History: Until 1300*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 14, 1971, pp. 725–732.
- (2139g) STANLEY J. ISSER: *The Dositheans: A Samaritan Sect in Late Antiquity* (originally diss., Columbia University, New York 1973; *The Samaritan Dositheans*). Leiden 1976.
- (2139h) ALAN D. CROWN: *The Samaritan Diaspora to the End of the Byzantine Era*. In: *Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology* 2.3, 1974–75, pp. 107–123.
- (2139i) R. J. COGGINS: *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered*. Oxford 1975.
- (2139j) ARYEH KASHER: *Some Suggestions and Comments Concerning Alexander Macedon's Campaign in Palestine* (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 20, 1975, pp. 187–208.
- (2139k) JOHN MACDONALD: *The Theology of the Samaritans*. London 1964.
- (2139l) JACOB FREUDENTHAL: *Hellenistische Studien; Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*. Heft I–II. Breslau (Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars). 1874–1875.
- (2139m) ROBERT J. BULL: *A Note on Theodotus' Description of Shechem*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 60, 1967, pp. 221–228.
- (2139n) S. LOWY: *The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis* (*Studia Post-Biblica*, 28). Leiden 1977.
- (2139o) HANS G. KIPPENBERG and GERD A. WEWERS: *Textbuch zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte* (*Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament. Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Ergänzungsreihe*, 8). Göttingen 1979.

MAYER (2123) has an exhaustive bibliography, the second version of which contains extensive additions and revisions.

I (2124) have a select bibliography focussing particularly on Josephus' treatment of the Samaritans.

WEISS (2125) has a brief classified bibliography in mimeographed form prepared for students at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem.

NOJA (2125a) lists 171 items of bibliography, with brief appraisals, in the area of research pertaining to Samaritan studies.

MARGAIN (2125b) provides a supplement to NOJA, especially for articles in French.

WEISS (2125c) is a supplement to the bibliography of MAYER (2123) and NOJA (2125a).

MOR (2125d) complements, for the years 1974–1978, the bibliographies of MAYER (2123), WEISS (2125) (2125c), and NOJA (2125a), and is especially useful for noting items omitted by his predecessors, particularly works written in Hebrew. MOR has a special section, with individual sub-topics, on items pertaining to the relationship between Samaritanism and early Christianity.

MONTGOMERY (2126), pp. 156–157, concludes that Josephus allows us to perceive the truth with regard to the Samaritans only through the contradictions in which he involves himself.

MOULTON (2127), especially pp. 161–164, has a good overall survey.

GASTER (2128), noting that Josephus unreservedly expresses his antipathy to the Samaritans, nonetheless shows that many of the legendary elements in Josephus' account find their source or parallel in the 'Asatir Mosheh' ('Secrets of Moses'), a Midrashic-like Samaritan work. He argues that Josephus was fully acquainted with Samaritan history and traditions but controverts much in favor of the Jews.

RICCIOTTI (2129) asserts that the evidence about the Samaritans in Josephus is very suspect and thinks that his source for some of it was an anti-Samaritan polemic. Thus he speaks of the obvious exaggeration in Josephus' smug account of the capture of Samaria by John Hyrcanus.

SPIRO (2130), pp. 323–328, finds an anti-Samaritan bias even in Josephus' account of the forefathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. He notices that Josephus, like Pseudo-Philo in his 'Biblical Antiquities', manages to forget Abram's stay at Shechem, forgets that Jacob built an altar there, omits Joseph's burial there, and makes a number of adjustments in his account of Joshua, filling up the gaps with rhetoric. Accepting the view of HÖLSCHER (2131), he concludes (p. 355) that Josephus' changes are due to the fact that his source was not the Bible or the Septuagint but a Hellenistic midrashic-like work which contained a bias against the Samaritans. We may comment that aside from the unlikelihood, as we have noted previously, that Josephus, who knew both Hebrew and Greek well, would not use the Hebrew and Greek Bibles, Pseudo-Philo agrees with Josephus in several of these omissions; and no one has suggested that Pseudo-Philo, who knew no Greek, resorted to such a Hellenistic midrash; there are, moreover, enough changes between his and Josephus' version to indicate that he did not derive it from Josephus. As I (2132), pp. xxxiv–xxxvi, have noted, the *argumentum ex silentio* is dangerous. Arguing along SPIRO's grounds, we might ask whether Josephus is less anti-Samaritan than Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' because the latter (18. 5, 32. 1–4) omits the fact that the planned sacrifice of Isaac took place in the land of Moriah (because, according to SPIRO



[2130], the Samaritan text of Genesis 22. 2 reads *ha-Mora'ah*, which could have been an allusion to Morah, a place near Shechem), whereas Josephus (Ant. 1. 224) mentions the name. We may ask whether the fact that the Septuagint renders *ha-Moriah* as ὑψηλήν "lofty," and the Vulgate renders it *in terram visionis* shows that they are engaging in anti-Samaritan polemic.

PARROT (2133), pp. 95–119, has a survey of Samaria in the Hellenistic and Roman periods in the light of Josephus (of whom he is generally uncritical) and archaeology.

BOWMAN (2134) describes the history of the Samaritans, their religious beliefs and ceremonies, and their relation to the Christians and the Dead Sea sect. He frequently refers to Josephus, though there is no extensive discussion of any particular passage.

ACKROYD (2135) says that Josephus' anti-Samaritan bias is due to his source, the Book of Chronicles. He concludes that at times Josephus oversimplifies, at other times elaborates, possibly on the basis of additional material but possibly imaginatively.

ZAYADINE (2136) has a brief historical survey.

OSIEK and REWOLINSKI (2137) contrast the tendentious altering of events (reflecting doctrinal considerations) in Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' with the rather rigorous adherence to the Biblical account in Josephus, who has no theological motives.

SMITH (2138), pp. 182–190, concludes that Josephus is practically worthless with regard to Samaritan affairs in the period from Nehemiah to Antiochus Euphron, since he projects onto earlier periods the hostilities against the Samaritans of his own day and merely repeats Biblical polemic. Josephus contradicts himself (Ant. 11. 340) when he calls the Samaritans apostate Jews. Family alliances between the Jerusalem high priests and the Samaritan rulers, says SMITH, helped Josephus to confuse the situation under Artaxerxes I with that under Artaxerxes III. Josephus knew nothing of Samaria's resettlement in the late fourth century, when, according to archaeological remains, the city was built. SMITH is highly critical, pp. 193–201, of ALT's (2139) theory of the origin of the Samaritans.

KITTEL (2139a) concludes that Josephus' account (Ant. 11. 304–312) concerning intermarriage with the Samaritans is historical and chronological, though not quite lucid.

GASTER (2139b) is suspicious with regard to the validity of Josephus' account of the Samaritan temple (Ant. 11. 321–328). He suggests that Josephus grotesquely patched together his story by fusing a Jewish and a Samaritan tradition.

JEREMIAS (2139c) deals briefly with Josephus' contemptuous references to the Samaritans.

WRIGHT (2139d), pp. 175–181, in a slightly revised version of his article (2139e), deals with the reason for the Samaritan construction of Shechem.

MACDONALD (2139f) discusses, without drawing conclusions, Josephus' reports concerning the Samaritans as contrasted with those in the Samaritan Chronicle II.

ISSER (2139g), pp. 5–11, discusses Josephus as a source for the Samaritans. Commenting on *Antiquities* 13. 74–79, he concludes that, despite its historical possibility, the dispute involving Ptolemy Philometor in Josephus smacks of propaganda and literary motif. The names Sabbaeus and Theodosius-Dositheus could be anachronistic. Josephus, says ISSER, wrote “Theodosius”, not “Dositheus”, and never implied that these men were anything but representatives of the Samaritans in Alexandria. The passage, he concludes, is ineffective for any kind of historical proof and even worse for evidence of a Dosithean Samaritan sect.

CROWN (2139h) notes that Josephus is the first non-Samaritan source for the Samaritan Diaspora (*Ant.* 11. 321–326, 340–346).

COGGINS (2139i), pp. 99–100, comments that the discovery of the Samaria papyri removes only one of the difficulties in Josephus’ account (the fact that there was more than one governor of Samaria named Sanballat), but that the other unhistorical features remain. He admits that on archaeological grounds it is likely that the temple on Mount Gerizim was built at about the time that Josephus implies. On the whole, however, Josephus’ version tells us more about the anti-Samaritan feeling of his own time than it does about the history of the fourth century B.C.E. Adopting an ‘even-handed’ approach toward the Jews and the Samaritans, COGGINS says that insofar as Josephus’ work was addressed to a Jewish audience, the repudiation of the Samaritans may well have been one of the purposes of his writing. COGGINS objects to the concept of a sudden schism between the Jews and the Samaritans: rather he speaks of a deterioration in relations between the two groups, the decisive time being the period between the third century B.C.E. and the beginning of the Christian Era.

KASHER (2139j) remarks that careful comparison of Josephus’ evidence and the Biblical tradition about the quarrel between the Jews and the Samaritans indicates two different versions. Since the discoveries of the Samaria papyri at the Wadi Daliah prove the existence of another Sanballat, in addition to the one mentioned in the Bible, Josephus’ testimony deserves a new treatment. KASHER concludes that the most important fact leading the Samaritans to rebel was the turn in Alexander’s relations with the Jews. He adds that some border districts were annexed to Judaea as a result of the suppression of the Samaritan rebellion.

MACDONALD (2139k), pp. 24–25, discusses Josephus as a historical source for the Samaritans. In particular, he comments (p. 365) on the Samaritan belief in Taheb, who will bring to light again the sanctuary originally erected on Mount Gerizim (cf. *Ant.* 18. 85–89).

Because Theodotus’ poem was entitled Περὶ Ἰουδαίων, FREUDENTHAL (2139l) doubts that the author was a Samaritan, since, he argues, no Samaritan could call himself a Jew. Yet, says BULL (2139m), this is precisely what the Samaritans did on occasions when it was politically expedient to do so. Thus, as Josephus (*Ant.* 11. 340–344) reports, when the Samaritans saw that Alexander had honored the Jews, they decided to profess themselves Jews. We may reply that no one will doubt that when it was a matter of expediency, Samaritans, as indeed most other groups under similar circumstances, did so. When, however,

it was not a matter of expediency, as indeed it was not here, would a poet, as in this case, do so?

LOWY (2139n), p. 482, compares Josephus' theology, especially the belief in divine providence, and exegesis with those of the Samaritans. He notes that there is a fairly close similarity between the reasons for the commandments given by the Samaritan exegetes and those given by the rabbis, whereas Hellenistic writers, such as Josephus, like the pagan Greeks, remove the divine element from history. Josephus, he (p. 493) says, prefers to moralize with a view to the edification of men; hence he concentrates on civil laws, which do not require rationalization: his method would thus be totally alien to the Samaritans.

KIPPENBERG and WEWERS (2139o), in the second part of their anthology of texts translated into German (with brief introductions), deal with the Samaritans, the Gerizim cult, the liturgies, the eschatological concepts, and the relation to Gnosticism and to the rabbinic tradition.

### 21.1: The Origin of the Samaritans

- (2140) JAMES A. MONTGOMERY: *The Samaritans: The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature*. Philadelphia 1907; rpt. New York 1968.
- (2141) RALPH MARCUS: Josephus on the Samaritan Schism (Ant. xi. 297–347). Appendix B. In: Josephus, vol. 6, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books IX–XI (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1937. Pp. 498–511.
- (2142) ADOLPHE (ADOLF) BUCHLER (= BÜCHLER); *La relation de Josèphe concernant Alexandre le Grand*. In: *Revue des Études juives* 36, 1898, pp. 1–26.
- (2143) MOSES H. SEGAL: *The Marriage of the Son of the High Priest with the Daughter of Sanballat and the Building of the Temple of Gerizim* (in Hebrew). In: MOSES D. (UMBERTO) CASSUTO, JOSEPH KLAUSNER, JOSHUA GUTMANN, edd., *Simcha Assaf Anniversary Vol.* Jerusalem 1952–53. Pp. 404–414.
- (2144) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: *Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple*. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 38, 1955–56, pp. 166–198. Rpt. in: HAROLD H. ROWLEY, *Men of G-d*. London 1963. Pp. 246–276.
- (2145) GEORGE ERNEST WRIGHT: *The Samaritans at Shechem*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 55, 1962, pp. 357–366.
- (2146) FRANK M. CROSS: *The Discovery of the Samaria Papyri*. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 26, 1963, pp. 110–121.
- (2147) FRANK M. CROSS: *Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 59, 1966, pp. 201–211.
- (2148) PETER R. ACKROYD: *Israel under Babylon and Persia* (New Clarendon Bible, Old Testament, 4). London 1970.
- (2149) IAN H. EYBERS: *Relations between Jews and Samaritans in the Persian Period*. In: *Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap van Suid-Afrika* 9, 1966, pp. 72–89.
- (2150) JACOB LIVER: *Sanballat* (in Hebrew). In: *Encyclopedia Mikrait* 5, 1968, pp. 1057–1061.
- (2151) MATTHIAS DELCOR: *Vom Sichem der hellenistischen Epoche zum Sychar des Neuen Testaments*. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 78, 1962, pp. 34–48.
- (2152) JAMES D. PURVIS: *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Origin of the Samaritan Sect*. Cambridge, Mass. 1968.

- (2153) HAIM (= HUGO) D. MANTEL: The Secession of the Samaritans (in Hebrew). In: Bar-Ilan 7-8, 1969-70, pp. 162-177.
- (2154) HANS G. KIPPENBERG: Garizim und Synagoge. Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode. Diss., Göttingen 1968-69. Publ. (Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, vol. 30): Berlin 1971.
- (2154a) J. G. VINK: The Samaritan Schism. In his: The Date and Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament. In: J. G. VINK et al., edd.: The Priestly Code and Seven Other Studies. Leiden 1969. Pp. 51-57.
- (2154b) SIGMUND MOWINCKEL: Studien zu dem Buche Ezra-Nehemia, 3 vols. (Die Nehemia-Denkschrift) (Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo, New Series, 3 and 5). Oslo 1964.

The Bible (II Kings 17. 24ff.) declares that the Samaritans arose from the mixture of peoples brought to Samaria by the Assyrians when they conquered the ten tribes in 722/721, and this view is adopted by Josephus (Ant. 9. 288-291). The Samaritans themselves claim direct descent from the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh and trace the schism with the Israelites to the time when the high priest Eli moved from Shechem to Shiloh. For practical purposes, however, the schism dates, according to the Bible, from the time when the Samaritans (ca. 430 B.C.E.) opposed Nehemiah's fortification of Jerusalem. Josephus (Ant. 11, 297-347) dates this schism, in effect, from the creation of the Samaritan temple on Mount Gerizim in 332 B.C.E., when Alexander conquered Palestine.

The date of the origin of the Samaritans has been the subject of much controversy, as we see from the surveys of MONTGOMERY (2140), pp. 66-69, and of MARCUS (2141), the latter of whom, through effective use of the Elephantine papyri, upholds a Scriptural date (ca. 430 B.C.E.) against Josephus.

A key point in the dispute, the identity of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria at the time of the schism, has now been illuminated by papyrological discoveries. The problem is that the Bible mentions Sanballat as a governor of Samaria ca. 445 B.C.E. at the time of Nehemiah, whereas Josephus tells a similar story but places Sanballat in the reign of Darius III and Alexander the Great a century later.

BÜCHLER (2142) divides Josephus' account of Sanballat into three layers, the first of Samaritan origin, the second of Jewish propagandist origin, and the third of Jewish anti-Samaritan origin.

SEGAL (2143) agrees with this analysis, remarking that only a Samaritan could have remembered that Sanballat was governor of Samaria and could have recalled the name of his daughter. The omission of any reference to Nehemiah supports this theory, he claims. We may object that such a vivisection of Josephus is hardly as likely as the view that Josephus had a single source, which was more balanced than either BÜCHLER or SEGAL will admit.

ROWLEY (2144) rejects the view that there were two Sanballats; but we may note that Josephus himself has two Sanballats, one of whom he calls Sambabab, who was the eparch of the Samaritans to whom the Persian king Darius wrote (Ant. 11. 118), and the other of whom he calls Sanaballetes, who was satrap of Samaria (Ant. 11. 302).

WRIGHT (2145) argues that there were two Sanballats, the second, through the practice of papponymy (naming a child after a grandfather), having been named after the first. He claims that archaeological observations show a sudden rebuilding of Shechem (Samaria) at the very time when Josephus asserts that the Samaritan temple was erected.

WRIGHT's position was dramatically confirmed by CROSS' (2146) (2147) announcement of the discovery of papyri at Samaria, establishing the historicity of a second Sanballat (besides the one who was Nehemiah's contemporary). The papyri and coins can be dated from 375 to 335 B.C.E.; and the papyri refer to Hananiah the son of Sanballat as governor of Samaria in 354 B.C.E. They, therefore, confirm that there was a Sanballat who was governor of Samaria between 400 and 360 B.C.E., roughly a generation before the dates of the Sanballat mentioned by Josephus. We may now assert that there were, indeed, three Sanballats who were governors of Samaria, that the governorship was thus hereditary, and that Josephus confused Sanballat I and III, just as he confused Jaddus the high priest under Darius II (Nehemiah 12. 22) with Jaddus the high priest in the time of Darius III.

ACKROYD (2148) follows CROSS in declaring that it is probable that there were three Sanballats. He adds that it is very uncertain how far we should regard Josephus' account of Johanan and Bagoas as historical; it may be a rather garbled narrative and may not belong to these personages at all.

EYBERS (2149) and LIVER (2150), commenting on CROSS' discovery, suggest that Josephus knew a tradition which associated the building of the temple of Gerizim with a Samaritan governor called Sanballat but that he erred in making him a contemporary of Alexander and in ascribing events from Nehemiah's contemporary to him. We may reply that Josephus has two Sanballats, as we have noted, and that the papyri have added a third; hence it is not far-fetched to presuppose a fourth at the time of Alexander, presumably from the same family.

DELCOR (2151) says simply that Josephus' account is not credible, primarily because Sanballat was a contemporary of Nehemiah (Nehemiah 6. 1), whereas he makes him a contemporary of Alexander (Ant. 11. 302ff.).

EYBERS (2149), arguing on the basis of the recently discovered Samaria Papyri, concludes that no final schism had taken place by 400, and that the split must be regarded as a gradual process which developed after 400. We may comment that there is no evidence connecting the building of the Samaritan temple with the Sanballat of the papyri, the name being common in the family generation after generation.

PURVIS (2152), pp. 99–105, notes that the claim that a Samaritan schism occurred in the Persian period as a result of the incident recounted in Nehemiah 13 rests solely on the assumption that Josephus' account (Ant. 11. 302–325) transfers the story of Sanballat to the period of Alexander. Josephus, says PURVIS, thus used the person of Sanballat to connect the Persian and Greek periods. He suggests that Josephus used a Samaritan source for at least part of his account of the construction of the Samaritan temple.

Inasmuch as CROSS (2147) cites evidence of contacts between Jews and Samaritans as late as the beginning of the first century B.C.E., MANTEL (2153),

noting that these contacts involved Scriptural texts, variant readings and spellings, though not the Oral Law, concludes that while the 'Community of Exile', the predecessors of the Pharisees, broke with the high priests (with whom the Samaritans were aligned) in the early days of the Second Temple over the question of the Oral Law, the split between the Sadducees and the Samaritans did not occur until John Hyrcanus' conquest of Shechem. One would think that the building of a temple on Mount Gerizim would be the final stroke severing relations, but, as MANTEL well notes, in the second century B.C.E. Ben Sira speaks of them not as a separate people but as refusing reunion with their brethren by foolishly and stubbornly rejecting the Oral Law. Yet, we may comment, the fact that the Talmud can still discuss the degree to which priests who had officiated at Leontopolis in Egypt (*Mishnah*, *Menaḥoth* 13. 10) are ineligible to officiate in Jerusalem and the degree to which Samaritans may be regarded as Jews shows that the split was hardly complete and final even for the Pharisees. That the Sadducees and the Samaritans were aligned seems, we may comment, likely enough in view of their negative attitude toward the Oral Law; and the fact that there are a number of similarities between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint which, according to tradition, was done by priests from Jerusalem, indicates a tie. But in view of the bitter feelings toward the Sadducees on the part of both Josephus and especially the rabbis, we would expect an accusation that the two groups were or are aligned; and there is no such hint. The Samaritans themselves, in their fullest history (*Chronicle II* = *Sefer ha-Yamim*), say that at the time of John Hyrcanus, there were three parties – the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Hasidim (whom they identify with themselves) – and that the Hasidim joined with the Sadducees against the Pharisees; but even this, if historical, may have been an alliance of convenience rather than of ideology. As to agreements between the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Septuagint, these correspondences are hardly systematic and, in any case, may reflect common traditions; certainly the rabbis, who bitterly attack the Septuagint in the tractate *Soferim* (1. 7), make no mention of such an alliance of the translators and the Samaritans.

KIPPENBERG (2154), through an analysis of Josephus (*Ant.* 11. 302–347), argues that the rivalry between Samaria and Judah in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.E. was not political but rather due to the differences in the Jerusalem priesthood. If so, he says, there may be a parallel to the circumstances surrounding the founding of the Qumran sect, which similarly disagreed with the Jerusalem priesthood with regard to sacrifices and may have founded their headquarters near the Dead Sea in a move of secession.

VINK (2154a), pp. 51–57, argues that we should discard the Hellenistic chronology, since it is polemical and biased, in Josephus' account (*Ant.* 11. 297–347) of the origin of the Samaritan schism. We can, however, retain the historical nucleus, notably Sanballat's request to Darius II. As for the deduction of MOWINCKEL (2154b), made from Josephus, that Darius II gave royal permission to build a Samaritan temple, it is highly unlikely that there is any historicity in the elaboration of *Nehemiah* 13.28.

## 21.2: The Building of the Samaritan Temple

- (2155) LAURENCE E. BROWNE: *Ezekiel and Alexander*. London 1952.
- (2156) MOSES H. SEGAL: The Marriage of the Son of the High Priest with the Daughter of Sanballat and the Building of the Temple of Gerizim (in Hebrew). In: JOSHUA GUTMANN, MOSES D. (UMBERTO) CASSUTO, JOSEPH KLAUSNER, edd., *Simcha Assaf Anniversary Volume*. Jerusalem 1952–53. Pp. 404–414.
- (2157) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 38, 1955–56, pp. 166–198. Reprinted in his: *Men of G-d*. London 1963. Pp. 246–276.
- (2158) JACOB LIVER: Sanballat (in Hebrew). In: *Encyclopaedia Mikraït* 5, 1968, pp. 1057–1061.
- (2159) ANDRÉ PARROT: *Samarie; capitale du royaume d'Israël* (*Cahiers d'archéologie biblique*, no. 7). Neuchâtel 1955. Trans. into English by SAMUEL H. HOOKE: *Samaria, the Capital of the Kingdom of Israel* (*Studies in Biblical Archaeology*, no. 7). New York 1955.
- (2160) MATTHIAS DELCOR: Vom Sichem der hellenistischen Epoche zum Sychar des Neuen Testaments. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 78, 1962, pp. 34–48.
- (2161) ELIAS BIKERMAN: Un document relatif à la persécution d'Antiochos IV Épiphanes. In: *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 115, 1937, pp. 188–223.
- (2162) FRANK M. CROSS: Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 59, 1966, pp. 201–211.
- (2163) PAUL W. LAPP: The Second and Third Campaigns at 'Arâq el-Emîr. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 171, 1963, pp. 8–39.
- (2164) HOWARD C. KEE: Tell-er-Ras and the Samaritan Temple. In: *New Testament Studies* 13, 1966–67, pp. 401–402.
- (2165) JOHN BOWMAN: La Genealogioj de la Ĉefpastroj en la Hebrea kaj la Samariana Tradicioj. In: *Biblia Revuo* 5, 1966, pp. 1–16.
- (2165a) GEORGE E. WRIGHT: *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City*. New York 1964; London 1965.
- (2165b) MENAHEM HARAN: *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford 1978.
- (2165c) EDWARD F. CAMPBELL: Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods. In: FRANK M. CROSS, ed., *Symposia Celebrating the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Schools of Oriental Research (1900–1975)*. Cambridge, Mass. 1979. Pp. 159–167.

BROWNE (2155), without examining the reliability of Josephus' account, accepts it as giving an accurate indication of the date (332 B.C.E.) of the building of the Samaritan temple, ascribes the Book of Ezekiel to this period, and, in a classic case of circular reasoning, proceeds with Ezekiel's help to reconstruct the sequence of events from Josephus' account.

SEGAL (2156), indulging in mere conjecture, accepts Josephus' statement as to the date when but not as to the manner how the Samaritan temple was built. He conjectures that the Samaritans built it not with Alexander's permission but through taking advantage of the decline of Persian power, that it might have been constructed not by Sanballat but by his descendants, and that the priests might have been descendants of Manasseh.

ROWLEY (2157) thinks that it is highly improbable that if Sanballat did not revolt from Darius and transfer his allegiance to Alexander until after the siege

of Tyre had begun and that if authority to build the Samaritan temple had not been obtained until after this, the temple could have been built within nine months after the beginning of the siege of Tyre. Similar doubts are raised by LIVER (2158). ROWLEY concludes that the erection of the temple and the Samaritan schism are two separate and unrelated questions; but, we may reply, all the sources, Samaritan and Jewish, do connect them.

PARROT (2159) suggests that the Samaritan temple was built in the reign of Artaxerxes II (405–358 B.C.E.), presumably because he thinks that the measures of Ezra and Nehemiah facilitated the institution of a rival cult among the mixed population of Samaria.

DELCOR (2160) says that the expression οἱ ἐν Σικίμοις Σιδωνιοὶ (Ant. 11. 344) refers not to the Samaritans, as BIKERMAN (2161) has declared, but to a colony of Hellenized Phoenician Sidonians, and points to an inscription referring to Sidonians of Marissa. He cites a parallel expression in Life 54: οἱ ἐν Ἐκβατάνοις Βαβυλώνιοι Ἰουδαῖοι. We may comment that in the context the Samaritans, who are speaking, are denying that they are Jews but declaring that they are Hebrews, presumably a more ancient term, and acknowledging that they are termed (Hellenized) Sidonians, a reference which is corroborated by archaeological discoveries.

CROSS (2162) notes that the Hellenistic era added at least three and perhaps four rival cults to the Temple in Jerusalem: the Samaritans on Mount Gerizim, the Temple of Onias at Leontopolis, the temple at 'Arâq el-'Emîr in Transjordan built by Hyrcanus of the Tobiad family and described by LAPP (2163), and the sacrificial cult conducted by the Dead Sea sect. The last is questionable, though the Essenes were disgruntled with the Temple (Ant. 18. 19). It seems easier to find a common denominator in the rise of these sects, namely dissatisfaction with the Jerusalem priesthood, than to presuppose four separate causes; but the building of the Samaritan temple precedes the other events by two centuries.

KEE (2164) describes the discovery, under the ruins of the Hadrianic temple of Zeus at Mount Gerizim, of remains of what seems to belong to a fourth-century Samaritan temple; if so, this would presumably be the Samaritan temple authorized by Alexander as reported by Josephus (Ant. 11. 310ff.).

I have not seen BOWMAN's (2165) account of the genealogies of the high priests in the Jewish (I Chronicles 5. 27–41, Ezra 7. 1–5, Nehemiah 11. 11, and Josephus) and Samaritan traditions.

WRIGHT (2165a), pp. 175–181, commenting on Antiquities 11. 302ff., accepts the substantial reliability of Josephus' first source about the Samaritans, namely the story of the founding of the temple on Mount Gerizim by permission of Alexander. As for the objections of ROWLEY (2157) that there was no time to erect the Temple in the nine months between the time that Alexander gave his permission and the time of Sanballat's death in Josephus' account, WRIGHT suggests that the Temple might have been virtually complete before Alexander's appearance in Tyre. Yet, he concludes, it must be granted that Josephus has confused events in two centuries.

HARAN (2165b), pp. 47–48, argues that the discovery of the Wadi Dâliyeh Papyri dealing with the Samaritans has led us to conclude that we can rely on



Josephus' statements so far as the Samaritan temple is concerned (Ant. 11. 302–303 and 11. 306–347).

CAMPBELL (2165c), pp. 160–161, on the basis of Josephus (Ant. 13. 73 and 256), compares the Samaritan temple with the Temple in Jerusalem and concludes that the Samaritans were less heretical than is often claimed.

### 21.3: Events in the History of the Samaritans

- (2166) JOHN W. CROWFOOT, KATHLEEN M. KENYON, ELEAZAR [ELIEZER] L. SUKENIK: The Buildings at Samaria. London 1942.
- (2167) JOHANNES IRMSCHER: Zum Διάταγμα Καίσαρος von Nazareth. In: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 42, 1949, pp. 172–184.
- (2168) WAYNE A. MEEKS: The Prophet-King. Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology. Leiden 1967.
- (2169) MARILYN F. COLLINS: The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period 3, 1972, pp. 97–116.
- (2170) ALEXANDER ZERON: Einige Bemerkungen zu M. F. Collins 'The Hidden Vessels in Samaritan Traditions'. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period 4, 1973, pp. 165–168.
- (2170a) FRANK M. CROSS: Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dāliyah: A Preliminary Report on Their Discovery and Significance. In: DAVID N. FREEDMAN and JONAS C. GREENFIELD, edd., New Directions in Biblical Archaeology. Garden City 1969. Pp. 41–62.
- (2170b) FRANK M. CROSS: A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 94, 1975, pp. 4–18.
- (2170c) J. G. VINK: The Samaritan Schism. In his: The Date and Origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament. In: J. G. VINK et al., edd.: The Priestly Code and Seven Other Studies. Leiden 1969. Pp. 51–57.
- (2170d) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Die Denkschrift der Samaritaner an König Antiochos Epiphanes zu Beginn der großen Verfolgung der jüdischen Religion im Jahre 167 v. Chr. (Josephus, AJ XII, §§ 258–264). In: Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 8, 1970–71, pp. 131–183.
- (2170e) ALAN D. CROWN: The Samaritan Diaspora to the End of the Byzantine Era. In: Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology 2.3, 1974–1975, pp. 107–123.
- (2170f) KARL JAROŠ: Sichem: Eine archäologische und religionsgeschichtliche Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung von Jos 24 (Orbis biblicus et orientalis, 11). Freiburg 1976.
- (2170g) KARL JAROŠ and BRIGITTE DECKERT: Studien zur Sichem-Area (Orbis biblicus et orientalis, 11a). Freiburg 1977.
- (2170h) AVRAHAM NEGEV: Samaria. In: RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites. Princeton 1976. P. 800.
- (2170i) ISAAC RABINOWITZ: The Meaning of the Key ('Demetrius')-Passage of the Qumran Nahum-Pesher. In: Journal of the American Oriental Society 98, 1978, pp. 394–399.

CROWFOOT-KENYON-SUKENIK (2166), noting the evidence of archaeology, conclude that Josephus (Ant. 13. 281) is exaggerating when he says that when Samaria was destroyed by John Hyrcanus no trace was left of the city. Josephus (*ibid.*) has been misinterpreted to mean that Hyrcanus destroyed the city by turning on streams of water, whereas actually his meaning is that winter rains

washed out the filling behind the walls. They also note that the evidence of archaeology confirms Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 13. 276–281, *War* 1. 64–65) that Samaria was starved out by Hyrcanus' generals, his sons Antigonus and Aristobulus, rather than taken by assault, since the breeches in the wall are not the result of military operations.

IRMSCHER (2167) suggests that the measures pertaining to violators of burials noted in an inscription were motivated by the incident related in *Antiquities* 18. 29–30 telling how the Samaritans scattered human bones in the porticoes of the Temple in Jerusalem.

MEEKS (2168), pp. 248–250, attempting to examine Samaritan traditions in Josephus' account (*Ant.* 18. 85–87) of the Samaritan prophet who promised to reveal the sacred vessels buried by Moses on Mount Gerizim, concludes that the connection of Moses with first-century eschatological hopes is unclear, as is the connection of the Samaritan in the story with traditions of Moses. MEEKS finds it difficult to see how the tradition could have arisen that Moses hid the vessels on Gerizim.

COLLINS (2169) concludes that Josephus' account (*Ant.* 18. 85–87) of the hidden vessels shows that by this time (the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate), the Samaritans had developed an eschatology. She suggests that the function of restoring the hidden vessels was assimilated by the Samaritans to Moses from the Elijah typology and that the function of concealing the vessels was drawn from the Jeremiah typology as found in the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, and the rabbinic tradition. This Samaritan tradition was countered by the rabbis (*Genesis Rabbah* 81. 4) and Pseudo-Philo (25. 10) by a tradition of hidden idols on Gerizim. We may suggest that Pilate's ruthless treatment of the multitude gathered round the Samaritan leader indicates that Pilate regarded him as a Messianic figure who would, in accordance with the prevalent view of the Messiah at that time, lead a political movement for independence.

ZERON (2170) objects that there is no basis in Pseudo-Philo (48) for the identification of Phinehas and Elijah. He suggests that the hidden vessels of the Samaritans may be referred to in Pseudo-Philo 35. 9.

CROSS (2170a), co-ordinating new papyrological finds with Josephus (*Ant.* 11. 297–345), concludes that the papyri establish a second Sanballat in the early fourth century and a third Sanballat in the period of Alexander. On the other hand, Josephus is not wholly vindicated, since it is clear that he identified the Biblical Sanballat and Sanballat III, jumping from the fifth to the late fourth century B.C.E.

CROSS (2170b), on the basis of his discovery in 1962 of the fourth-century B.C.E. papyri in Samaria, reconstructs, in co-ordination with Josephus, the sequence of governors in Samaria and gives a sketch of the era of the restoration. The sequence of Sanballatids confirms that two generations are missing in the Biblical genealogy of the Jewish high priests. This lacuna in the fourth century is supplied by Josephus (*Ant.* 11. 302–347). The assumption that Josephus confused Bagoas the general with the Bagoas of the Aramaic papyri, the successor to Nehemiah, as governor of Judah, is unfounded. The Sanballat of Josephus proves to be Sanballat III, the contemporary of Darius III and

Alexander. Josephus, moreover, is probably correct in stating that the Israelites in Samaria frequently intermarried with the high-priestly family in Jerusalem. Finally, Cross notes the frequency of papponymy, with the name Tobiah recurring nine times, Sanballat six times, Yoḥanan seven times, and Amminadab six times. We may, however, comment that recurrence of a name is not necessarily an indication of a person being named after a grandfather, any more than the frequent recurrence of a name today would necessarily indicate such a relationship.

VINK (2170c), pp. 50–51, concludes that if we rely upon Josephus alone, we are led to believe that the Bagoas of the temple conflict was the famous military commander of Artaxerxes III (350–338 B.C.E.). But this possibility, already tenuous in itself, is ruled out by the Elephantine papyri, in which Joḥanan and Bagoas are mentioned together.

SCHALIT (2170d), commenting on Antiquities 12. 258–264, emphasizes that the Samaritans insisted that there was no connection between their Sabbath and the Jewish Sabbath. He explains their choice of Zeus Hellenios as the god of Mount Gerizim on the ground that Zeus was a god of rain.

CROWN (2170e) concludes that Josephus may be correct in reporting Alexander's meetings with the Jews and the Samaritans.

JAROŠ (2170f), pp. 105–106, cites, with little comment, Antiquities 11. 340 in concluding that Sichem at the time of Alexander was the chief city of the Samaritans. He also cites Antiquities 13. 255–256 on the destruction of Sichem by Hyrcanus.

JAROŠ and DECKERT (2170g), pp. 43–46, after giving a brief summary of the history of Sichem in the Hellenistic period, conclude that the separation of the Samaritans and the Jews occurred in Maccabean days and was completed by Hyrcanus.

NEGEV (2170h) has a systematic survey of the history of Samaria in the light of the principal archaeological discoveries.

RABINOWITZ (2170i), conjecturing on the identity of the Demetrius mentioned in 4QpNah3–4I:1–2, says that the only central Palestinian city mentioned in our sources in the time of any Demetrius is Samaria, which was demolished by John Hyrcanus in 107 B.C.E. (Ant. 13. 280–281).

## 22: The Pharisees and Divergent Jewish Sects

### 22.0: The Jewish Sects: General

- (2171) HERBERT PREISKER: *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*. Berlin 1937.
- (2172) BEN-ZION KATZ: *Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots, Christians. A New View in the Investigation of Jewish History* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1947.
- (2173) LOUIS GINZBERG: *Boethusians*. In: *Jewish Encyclopaedia* 3, 1902, pp. 284–285.
- (2174) EMIL SCHÜRER: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Vol. 2. 4th ed., Leipzig 1907.
- (2175) JOSEPH BONSIIVEN: *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ. Sa Théologie*. 2 vols. Paris 1934–35 (abridged ed., Paris 1950). Abridged edition trans. into English by WILLIAM WOLF: *Palestinian Judaism in the Time of Jesus Christ*. New York 1964.
- (2176) RALPH MARCUS: *Pharisees, Essenes, and Gnostics*. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 73, 1954, pp. 157–161.
- (2177) HORST R. MOEHRING: *Novelistic Elements in the Writings of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., University of Chicago 1957.
- (2178) ALPHONSE E. TRICOT: *Le monde juif palestinien au temps du Christ*. In: ANDRÉ ROBERT and ALPHONSE E. TRICOT, edd., *Initiation Biblique: Introduction à l'Étude des Saintes Écritures*. 3rd ed., Paris 1954. Pp. 734–792.
- (2179) ALPHONSE E. TRICOT: *Le monde juif*. In: ANDRÉ ROBERT and ANDRÉ FEUILLET, edd., *Introduction à la Bible*. Vol. 2. Tournai 1959.
- (2180) PHILIP SEIDENSTICKER: *Die Gemeinschaftsform der religiösen Gruppen des Spätjudentums und der Urkirche*. In: *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 9, 1959, pp. 94–198.
- (2181) JAMES W. PARKES: *The Foundations of Judaism and Christianity*. Chicago 1960.
- (2182) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *King Herod, the Man and His Work* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1960. Trans. into German by JEHOCHUA AMIR: *König Herodes, Der Mann und sein Werk*. Berlin 1968.
- (2183) MARCEL SIMON: *Les Sectes juives au Temps de Jésus*. ('Mythes et Religions', no. 40) Paris 1960. Trans. into Spanish: *Las sectas judias en el tiempo de Jesus*. Buenos Aires 1962. Trans. into German by EGON WILHELM and BRUNO STORNI: *Die jüdischen Sekten zur Zeit Christi*. Einsiedeln 1964. Trans. into English by JAMES H. FARLEY: *Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus*. Philadelphia 1967.
- (2184) MORDECAI PIRON: *The Sects in the Days of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). In: *Maḥanayim* 62, 1962, pp. 16–21.
- (2185) HENRI DANIEL-ROPS: *La vie quotidienne en Palestine au Temps de Jésus Christ*. Paris 1961. Trans. into English by PATRICK O'BRIAN: *Daily Life in Palestine at the Time of Christ*. London 1962. Trans. into German by SIGRID STAHLMANN: *Er kam in sein Eigentum. Die Umwelt Jesu*. Stuttgart 1963. Trans. into Swedish by SVEN STOLPE: *Dagligt liv i Palestina på Jesu tid*. Stockholm 1964. Trans. into Dutch by B. KARSTEN-VAN ROSSEM: *Het dagelijks leven in Palestina ten tijde van Jezus*. Utrecht 1965. Trans. into Polish by JANINA LASOCKA: *Poznań 1965*. Trans. into Spanish by R. ANAYA: *La vida cotidiana en Palestina en tiempo de Jesús*. Barcelona 1965.

- (2186) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Rise and Fall of the Judaeen State: A Political, Social and Religious History of the Second Commonwealth*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia 1962. Trans. into Hebrew by MEIR ZELTZER: *History of the Second Temple*. Jerusalem 1968.
- (2187) HELMER RINGGREN: *Israelitische Religion*. Stuttgart 1963. Trans. into English by DAVID E. GREEN: *Israelite Religion*. Philadelphia 1966.
- (2188) BØRGE SALOMONSEN: Einige kritische Bemerkungen zu Stauffer's Darstellung der spätjüdischen Ketzergesetzgebung. In: *Studia Theologica* (Aarhus) 18, 1964, pp. 91–118.
- (2189) ETHELBERT STAUFFER: *Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Bern 1957.
- (2190) HEINZ KREISSIG: Zur Rolle der religiösen Gruppen in den Volksbewegungen der Hasmonäerzeit. In: *Klio* 43–45, 1965, pp. 174–182.
- (2191) MERRILL C. TENNEY: *New Testament Times*. Grand Rapids 1965.
- (2192) LEAH BRONNER: *Sects and Separatism During the Second Jewish Commonwealth: A study of the origin of Religious Separatism with special reference to the rise, growth and development of the various Sects, including the Dead Sea Community (originally a thesis for a Master's degree at the University of Witwatersrand, South Africa)*. New York 1967.
- (2193) DAVID S. RUSSELL: *The Intertestamental Period*. In: *Baptist Quarterly* 22, 1967, pp. 215–224.
- (2194) CLEMENS THOMA: Auswirkungen des jüdischen Krieges gegen Rom (66–70/73 n. Chr.) auf das rabbinische Judentums. In: *Biblische Zeitschrift* 12, 1968, pp. 30–54, 186–210.
- (2195) WILLIAM R. FARMER: *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus. An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*. New York 1956, 1963.
- (2196) MARTIN HENGEL: *Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.* Leiden 1961.
- (2197) MARTIN NOTH: *Geschichte Israels*. Göttingen 1950; 6th ed. 1966. Trans. into English by STANLEY GODMAN: *The History of Israel*. London 1958; 2nd ed., 1960.
- (2198) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity: Certainties and Uncertainties*. New York 1969.
- (2199) KURT SCHUBERT: *A Divided Faith: Jewish Religious Parties and Sects*. In: ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE, ed., *The Crucible of Christianity: Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith*. London 1969. Pp. 77–98.
- (2200) KURT SCHUBERT: *Die jüdischen Religionsparteien in neutestamentlicher Zeit* (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien, 43). Stuttgart 1970.
- (2201) PAOLO SACCHI: *Appunti per una storia della crisi della legge nel Giudaismo del tempo di Gesù*. In: *Bibbia e Oriente* 12, 1970, pp. 199–211.
- (2202) SHMUEL SAFRAI: *The Jewish People in the Days of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1970.
- (2203) JOHANN MAIER: *Geschichte der jüdischen Religion. Von der Zeit Alexander des Großen bis zur Aufklärung mit einem Ausblick auf das 19./20. Jahrhundert*. Berlin 1972.
- (2204) JULIUS WELLHAUSEN: *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer: eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte*. Greifswald 1874; 2nd ed., 1924.
- (2205) WILLIAM O. E. OESTERLEY: *A History of Israel*. 2 vols. Oxford 1932.
- (2206) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *History of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). 5 vols. Jerusalem 1949.
- (2207) VICTOR TCHERIKOVER: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia 1959.
- (2208) HUGO MANTEL: *The Dichotomy of Judaism during the Second Temple*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44, 1973, pp. 55–87.
- (2209) GERHARD MAIER: *Die jüdischen Lehrer bei Josephus: Einige Beobachtungen*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersu-*

- chungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 260–270.
- (2210) MORTON SMITH: *Varieties of Judaism in the Early First Century C.E.* (Conference held at Indiana University, March 1975). Abstract in: *Association for Jewish Studies Newsletter*, no. 14, June 1975, pp. 9 and 20.
- (2210a) MICHEL NICOLAS: *Des doctrines religieuses des Juifs pendant les deux siècles antérieures à l'ère chrétienne*. Paris 1860; 2nd ed., 1867.
- (2210b) EDWYN R. BEVAN: *The Jews*. In: *Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 9. Cambridge 1951. Pp. 397–436.
- (2210c) LEONHARD GOPPELT: *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert. Ein Aufriß der Urgeschichte der Kirche*. Gütersloh 1954.
- (2210d) PROSPER ALFARIC: *Origines sociales du Christianisme*. Paris 1956. Trans. into German: Berlin 1963.
- (2210e) NAHUM N. GLATZER: *Hillel the Elder: The Emergence of Classical Judaism*. New York 1956. Trans. into German: *Hillel. Repräsentant des klassischen Judentums*. Frankfurt a. M. 1966.
- (2210f) PAUL HOFFMANN: *Die Toten in Christus. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie* (revised version of his diss.: *Der Christ zwischen Tod und Auferstehung nach der Auffassung des Paulus*. München 1959). (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, n. F. Bd. 2), Münster 1966.
- (2210g) MORTON SMITH: *The Dead Sea Sect in Relation to Ancient Judaism*. In: *New Testament Studies* 7, 1960–61, pp. 347–360.
- (2210h) KURT SCHUBERT: *Die jüdischen Religionsparteien im Zeitalter Jesu*. In: KURT SCHUBERT, ed., *Der historische Jesus und der Christus unseres Glaubens, eine katholische Auseinandersetzung mit den Folgen der Entmythologisierungstheorie*. Im Auftrag des Katholischen Akademikerverbandes der Erzdiözese Wien. Wien 1962. Pp. 15–101.
- (2210i) ROBERT M. GRANT: *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*. New York 1963.
- (2210j) EDUARD LOHSE: *Umwelt des Neuen Testaments* (Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament, Bd. 1). Göttingen 1971. Trans. into English by JOHN E. STEELY: *The New Testament Environment*. Nashville 1976.
- (2210k) PAUL JOHNSON: *A History of Christianity*. London 1976.
- (2210l) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *Judaism and Christian Beginnings*. New York 1978.
- (2210m) JOSEPH D. AMUSIN: *The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries* (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166). In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 48, 1977, pp. 123–152.
- (2210n) JOHN D. WILKINSON: *Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It: Archaeology as Evidence*. London, New York 1978.
- (2210o) WILLIAM D. DAVIES: *Invitation to the New Testament: A Guide to Its Main Witnesses*. London 1967.
- (2210p) DAVID FLUSSER: *Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes in Peshet Nahum* (in Hebrew). In: MENAHEM DORMAN, SHMUEL SAFRAI, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *In Memory of Gedaliahu Alon, Essays in Jewish History and Philology*. Tel-Aviv 1970. Pp. 133–168.
- (2210q) DAVID FLUSSER: *The Jewish Religion in the Second Temple Period*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (*World History of the Jewish People*, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 3–40, 322–324.
- (2210r) KARL HOHEISEL: *Das antike Judentum in christlicher Sicht. Ein Beitrag zur neueren Forschungsgeschichte* (*Studies in Oriental Religion*, 2). Wiesbaden 1978.
- (2210s) B. JAY: *Le monde de Nouveau Testament* (*Collection Théologique*). Yaoundé 1978.
- (2210t) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: *'Volk G-t'es' im Frühjudentum: Eine Untersuchung der 'ekklesiologischen' Typen des Frühjudentums*. In: *Kairos* 21, 1979, pp. 30–47.

PREISKER (2171), pp. 254–260, has a brief survey of Jewish splinter groups, especially the Essenes and the Zealots.

KATZ (2172) postulates a connection between the Sadducees and the Zealots, identifying the Sadducees as disciples of Saddok (Ant. 18. 4), one of the founders of the Fourth Philosophy. We may comment, however, that the Sadducees are mentioned by Josephus as existing long before the period of this Saddok, who lived at the beginning of the first century. The name of the Sadducees, we may add, is connected either with Zadok, the disciple of Antigonos of Sokho (Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan 5) or, more probably, with Zadok the high priest in the days of David (II Samuel 8. 17). KATZ identifies the Talmud's Boethusians with the Essenes; but it is quite clear that the terms Boethusians and Sadducees are used interchangeably in the Talmud and that, at best, the Boethusians were a branch of the Sadducees, as GINZBERG (2173) and SCHÜRER (2174), pp. 478–479, contend.

BONSIRVEN (2175) is antiquated and has an unfair, condescending view of rabbinic Judaism. He regards Josephus' account as distorted by his apologetic concern for his Greco-Roman readers.

In the light of rabbinic works, the Apocrypha, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, MARCUS (2176) plausibly suggests that in place of Josephus' scheme (Ant. 18. 11–25) of four sharply-defined sects, a more fluid scheme, highlighting, in particular, the close relationship of the Essenes and the apocalyptic Pharisees, be presented as follows: extreme right – Sadducees; center – Pharisees (right wing: Shammites; middle: Hillelites; left: Apocalyptic Pharisees; unclassified: 'Am Ha-arez); left of center – Essenes and Gnostics; extreme left – Zealots. If we adopt such a scheme we may add to the left of center the Dead Sea Sect(s) and to the extreme left the Sicarii. Even such a picture is hardly complete, since the Jerusalem Talmud (Sanhedrin 10. 6. 29c) speaks of twenty-four sects of heretics. Moreover, it is not clear whether MARCUS is referring to the political or religious right and left. If he is looking at the parties from the religious point of view, groups such as the Zealots are extremely 'conservative'; if from a political point of view, in terms of their attitude toward revolution, groups such as the Essenes are extremely 'conservative'.

MOEHRING (2177) discusses the novelistic-erotic elements in Josephus' descriptions of the sects (War 2. 119–166, Ant. 18. 11–25). While he does not prove that these elements are Josephus' own invention, since they may have been found in Josephus' sources, he does make a *prima facie* case, inasmuch as similar novelistic-erotic elements can be found throughout Josephus' rehandling of the Bible, Herod, the persecution of the Jews in Rome (Ant. 18. 66–84), etc.

TRICOT (2178) (2179) presents brief, general surveys of the sects. He concludes that Josephus does not exaggerate when he declares that in his time the Pharisees had the favor and esteem of the masses; but recent scholarship, we may note, has cast considerable doubt on this conception of a 'normative' Judaism. He notes that Josephus does not hide his favoritism for the Pharisees against the Sadducees, and that hence he is sometimes unjust to the Sadducees; but, as we note below, Josephus is also critical of the Pharisees. TRICOT does not discuss Josephus' account of the Essenes critically.

SEIDENSTICKER (2180) concentrates on the Pharisees and the Essenes and is particularly critical of Josephus' report on the latter.

PARKES (2181), pp. 95–103, has a popular account of the emergence of the sects emphasizing the Sadducees' success in effecting a working compromise between Judaism and Hellenism.

SCHALIT (2182) says that Josephus is wrong in listing the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes as Jewish sects which originated in the Hasmonean period, that the only Jewish sect during this period was the Essenes, and that the Pharisees and Sadducees were 'religious Halakhic' groups with roots deep in pre-Maccabean Judaism. We may comment that Josephus does not say that the sects arose but existed (ἦσαν) in the Hasmonean period. In fact, he says (Ant. 18. 11) that the three philosophies of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes existed from the most ancient times (ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου).

SIMON (2183), basing himself primarily on the unpublished notes of ROGER GOOSSENS, presents a brief, general survey of the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, Zealots, and Alexandrian Judaism.

PIRON (2184) presents a popular survey of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes according to Josephus and the Talmud.

DANIEL-ROPS (2185) correctly comments that in Jesus' time every religious discussion had its political consequences and vice versa. Consequently there arose a tremendous variety of parties such as would put to shame the Third or Fourth French Republic.

Some of the most original and most controversial sections of ZEITLIN (2186) deal with the sects.

RINGGREN (2187), pp. 342–348, has a very brief, useful summary of modern scholarship which does not seek originality. He notes that Josephus gives a distorted view of the parties focussing almost exclusively, for the sake of his Greek readers, on their 'philosophic' views (hence the term Fourth Philosophy) rather than on their origins and history.

SALOMONSEN (2188) has a detailed critique of STAUFFER's (2189) views concerning Jewish legislation on heretics. Though STAUFFER calls his study a sketch it is nonetheless tendentious.

KREISSIG (2190) has a Marxist interpretation of the sects as indicating a class struggle. He notes that Josephus is completely silent about the social aspects of the sects (though, we must add, this is not true for the Essenes or for the followers of Simon bar Giora) and thinks that Judaism went through a development like that of Athens in Solon's time.

TENNEY (2191), pp. 94–100, has a general discussion of Josephus' notices on the four sects.

BRONNER (2192), pp. 86–105, has a general discussion of the rise and growth of the various sects and of the role which these sects played in molding Jewish life and thought.

RUSSELL (2193) presents a brief summary of the more important works which had appeared during the previous fifteen years dealing with the sects. He rightly says that it is misleading to speak about the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Fourth Philosophy as sects in the way in which Josephus does,



since they were concerned not so much with 'orthodoxy' as with 'orthopraxis', that is, correct conduct in accordance with the law.

THOMA (2194) challenges the views of FARMER (2195), HENGEL (2196), and NOTH (2197) that the war against Rome brought about a major change in Judaism. Recent archaeological discoveries support THOMA's view that before 70, and not merely after that date, Judaism had many groups, and that, in fact, we should broaden our picture of what constitutes 'normative' Judaism.

SANDMEL (2198), pp. 58–106, in a clear, fair-minded, and well-written essay, says that we can look to Josephus primarily for events but not for information on the doctrines, institutions, and underlying currents that fashioned rabbinic Judaism. The account of the sects is apologetic, he says, and unduly influenced by Josephus' attempt to equate them to Greek philosophies.

SCHUBERT (2199), in a popular, lavishly illustrated essay on the religious movements of the time, differentiates between the Pharisees and apocalyptic groups which drew political conclusions from their apocalyptic outlook. He expands (2200) on this essay, tracing the background of the sects, especially of the Hasidim. Josephus, he argues, must be used not uncritically, since he adapted his views for his pagan readers so that, for example, the Pharisaic teaching on the resurrection of the dead became a statement of the immortality of the soul; but, we may comment, the Pharisees believed in immortality (Shabbath 152 b, etc.) also.

SACCHI (2201) summarizes Josephus' statements about the three main sects, and discusses them with references to the Qumran sect as well.

SAFRAI (2202) has popular radio addresses on the three chief sects.

MAIER (2203), pp. 43–79, presents a survey of the sects.

WELLHAUSEN (2204), pp. 78–86, SCHÜRER (2174), p. 442, OESTERLEY (2205), KLAUSNER (2206), vol. 3<sup>2</sup>, p. 118, and TCHERIKOVER (2207), p. 491, all trace the rise of the sects back to the beginning of the Hasmonean era. The only evidence for this is that the first time the sects are mentioned in Josephus' 'Antiquities' is in the midst of his description of the reign of Jonathan the Hasmonean (160–143 B.C.E.) (Ant. 13. 171–173). But MANTEL (2208) argues that the controversy between the Pharisees and Sadducees is merely a continuation of the dispute between the Zadokite high priests and the Sons of the Golah mentioned by Ezra, and that the nucleus of the dispute may go back to the period of the First Temple. We may again note the fact that Josephus says not that the sects arose at this time but that they existed (ἤσαν), and again, when he discusses the sects in connection with the rise of the Fourth Philosophy (Ant. 18. 11), he says that they existed from the most ancient times (ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου). Still one must admit that the 'logical' place for a discussion of the sects is in connection with the rise of the Fourth Philosophy, when indeed such a description is introduced in both the 'War' (2. 119–166) and the 'Antiquities' (18. 11–25). There is no connection between Josephus' description of them in Antiquities 13. 171–173 and the narrative of Jonathan the Hasmonean.

MAIER (2209), comparing the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, especially on the issue of free will, contends that the division in Josephus' time was no

longer in terms of the pious, the wise, and the students, but rather in terms of religious groups or sects.

SMITH (2210) suggests that Josephus' introduction of the sects immediately after Jonathan's acceptance of the high priesthood may reflect difficulties precipitated by increasing Maccabean divergence from Pentateuchal law. Such difficulties, in turn, would explain the Maccabees' later policy of forced conversion, and this, in turn, the multiplication of the more eccentric sects. All this, we may reply, is rather highly conjectural.

NICOLAS (2210a) traces the history of religious movements in Palestine and in the Diaspora and gives a systematic exposition of Jewish doctrines.

BEVAN (2210b), pp. 406–416, has a brief survey of 'Jewish Parties and the Law'.

GOPPELT (2210c), pp. 20–38, presents a brief survey of the development of Judaism, sociologically and religiously, at the time of Jesus.

ALFARIC (2210d), especially pp. 48–77, has a general survey of the Sadducees, Pharisees, Zealots, and Essenes.

GLATZER (2210e), pp. 14–23, has a popular survey, largely dependent on Josephus, of the historical and cultural background of the period, with particular emphasis on the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes.

HOFFMANN (2210f), pp. 79–80, discusses the views held by the Essenes, Pharisees, and Sadducees, according to Josephus, on resurrection and on the world beyond.

SMITH (2210g) traces the development of normative Judaism, particularly during the period of Nehemiah and of his successors, as reported in Josephus, as a background for the formation of the sects.

SCHUBERT (2210h) summarizes the beliefs, practices, and history of the Essenes (pp. 49–55), the Pharisees (pp. 57–80), and the Sadducees (pp. 80–82).

GRANT (2210i), pp. 257ff., discusses the rise of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. He is uncritical in his approach to Josephus.

LOHSE (2210j) concludes that Josephus slants his accounts of the sects and of John the Baptist to suit Greek readers, who were concerned with immortality of the soul rather than with eschatology.

JOHNSON (2210k), pp. 14–20, presents a brief uncritical summary of the Jewish sects at the time of Jesus.

SANDMEL (2210l), pp. 156–166, briefly and clearly comments on Josephus' views concerning the Sadducees, the Pharisees, the Fourth Philosophy, and the Essenes. He avoids stretching the evidence too far.

AMUSIN (2210m) remarks that the division of the social movements into three struggling groups – Ephraim, Manasseh, and Judah – as shown in the Commentary on Nahum (4Q 169 = 4QpNah) corresponds with Josephus' statements about the three philosophical schools. We may remark, however, that such an analogy is far-fetched, since the division in the commentary on Nahum is based on genealogy and geography, rather than on theological beliefs.

WILKINSON (2210n), pp. 66–68, commenting on the four schools, notes that, according to Josephus, the Essenes had 4000, whereas the Pharisees had 6000 adherents, and concludes that they were therefore small movements. We

may, however, remark that Josephus himself says (Ant. 18. 15) that the Pharisees were extremely influential among the masses, and one guesses that the number 6000 is that of leaders or party 'members'.

DAVIES (2210o), pp. 26–38, comments, in popular style, on the background of first-century Judaism, including the the three sects.

I have not seen FLUSSER (2210p). [See *infra*, p. 946.]

FLUSSER (2210q) argues that the origin of the beliefs of the three sects preceded the social consolidation of the groups.

HOHEISEL (2210r), pp. 115–116, comments on the depiction of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees in Josephus and stresses that the Fourth Philosophy was merely the militant wing of the Pharisees.

JAY (2210s) surveys the chief Jewish religious groups in Palestine and in the Diaspora.

BAUMBACH (2210t) speaks of three major religious groups among the Jews: 1) spiritualistic-universal, consisting of radical Hellenizers and moderate reformers such as Philo; 2) particularistic hierocratic, consisting of the Maccabees and Sadducees; and 3) pietistic-nomistic, consisting of the Hasideans, Essenes, and Pharisees. All stressed the importance of Jewish birth, circumcision, and the *mitzvot*, though there were differences in emphasis. We may comment that to speak of the radical Hellenizers as spiritualistic-universal, whereas the Pharisees, particularly in their attitude toward seeking converts, would qualify for this label, is a misinterpretation. Again, to speak of Philo as a moderate reformer is to misrepresent a Jew who prided himself on his orthodoxy.

## 22.1: The Views of the Sects: Fate and Prophecy

- (2211) LUDWIG WÄCHTER: Die unterschiedliche Haltung der Pharisäer, Sadduzäer und Essener zur Heimarmene nach dem Bericht des Josephus. In: Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte 21, 1969, pp. 97–114.
- (2212) PAOLO SACCHI: Appunti per una storia della crisi della legge nel giudaismo del tempio di Gesù. In: Bibbia e Oriente 12, 1970, pp. 199–211.
- (2213) GERHARD MAIER: Mensch und freier Wille nach den jüdischen Religionsparteien zwischen Ben Sira und Paulus. Diss., University of Tübingen 1969–70. Publ.: Tübingen 1971.
- (2214) GEORGE F. MOORE: Fate and Free Will in the Jewish Philosophies according to Josephus. In: Harvard Theological Review 22, 1929, pp. 371–389.
- (2215) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Josephus. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (2216) JOSEPH BLENKINSOPP: Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus. In: Journal of Jewish Studies 25, 1974, pp. 239–262.
- (2216a) EDWYN R. BEVAN: The Jews. In: Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. 9. Cambridge 1951. Pp. 397–436.
- (2216b) FRIEDRICH NÖTSCHER: Schicksal und Freiheit. In Biblica 40, 1959, pp. 446–462. Rpt. in his: Vom Alten zum Neuen Testament. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Bonn 1962. Pp. 1–16.

(2216c) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: *Hazal: The Sages, Their Concepts and Beliefs* (in Hebrew). 2 vols. Tel-Aviv 1969; 2nd ed., Jerusalem 1971. Trans. into English by ISRAEL ABRAHAMS: *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs*. Jerusalem 1975.

WÄCHTER (2211) asks why Josephus chose to organize his description of the three sects around the concepts of fate and answers that it is because he is writing for a Hellenistic audience which was interested in such distinctions, as we see in his comparison of the Pharisees to the Stoics (Life 12) and of the Essenes to the Pythagoreans (Ant. 15. 371), so that the Sadducees are implicitly compared with the Epicureans. It is striking that neither the Talmud nor the New Testament mentions that the Sadducees reject Divine Providence. We may comment that the fact that the Talmud does not mention the Sadducees' attitude toward Fate and Providence is due to its not being primarily interested in theology but in practical *mitzvot*: hence for the rabbis the main point of difference is that the Sadducees do not accept their concept of the oral law. It is surprising, we may add, that Josephus, who compares the Pharisees with the Stoics, does not make the obvious comparison of the Sadducees with the Epicureans, especially since he is so strongly opposed to them (Ant. 18. 17) and since he describes (Ant. 11. 277–280) the views of the Epicureans about Providence in terms very similar to those of the Sadducees about Fate. We may further comment that the fact that Josephus says that the Pharisees, who, he says, are not thoroughgoing fatalists, rather than the Essenes, who are fatalists, nearly resemble (παράπλησιος, Life 12) the Stoics, shows that he identified Stoicism not with Zeno's complete fatalism but with the view of Chrysippus, who, despite his determinism, allowed some power to man to withhold or grant assent. We may be tempted to say that perhaps Josephus compared the sects with regard to their attitude toward fate because this was the major or even only point on which they all differed from one another; but, in reply, we may note that there were more vital differences in their attitude and observance of the law; moreover, when Josephus mentions the Fourth Philosophy, he does not contrast them with each of the other sects but notes that they agree with the Pharisees in all respects except in their refusal to accept a human king.

SACCHI (2212) summarizes the views of the sects with regard to fate.

MAIER (2213), too, remarks on the striking fact that it should be the attitude toward fate that is the point of difference stressed by Josephus in his discussion of the sects. We may comment that this is another indication of the influence of Stoicism on Josephus, since for the Stoics this was a central point in their philosophy. MOORE (2214) suggests that Josephus' source for this contrast of views of fate is Nicolaus of Damascus; HÖLSCHER (2215), cols. 1943 ff., suggests a Jewish source but not Josephus. MAIER sees the source in Josephus himself, who, he says, received assistance from Nicolaus and Philo. We may remark that there is no particular reason why Nicolaus should have discussed the Essenes, especially at such length. As to Philo, there is some evidence noted above that Josephus was influenced by him; but Philo, at least in what is extant of him, never compares the sects, and his discussion of the Essenes makes no mention of their attitude toward fate. MAIER concludes that the topic of free will and deter-

minism was a significant part of the discussion of Jewish theological controversies of the time, and that Josephus' account is, on the whole, credible. We may reply, however, that such an attempt to 'theologize' Judaism is not consonant with its description in the Talmud, which is by far the most important, most characteristic, and most inclusive Jewish document of the period. MAIER corrects, where necessary, Josephus' comparison of the sects on the basis of other contemporary sources, admitting that Josephus was concerned with reaching a Greek public or Greek-thinking Jews.

BLINKINSOPP (2216) concludes that from the point of view of their attitude toward prophecy, both the Essenes and the Zealots had much in common with the Pharisees. Both the Pharisees and the Essenes thought of themselves, moreover, in cultic and priestly terms. As for the Zealots, Josephus blames their pseudo-prophets for the catastrophe of the war against Rome.

BEVAN (2216a) comments on the fact that Josephus emphasizes fate in his discussion of the sects and asserts that the rabbis confirm its importance. We may, however, remark that the rabbis do not even mention the Essenes, and that, as far as the difference between the Pharisees and the Sadducees is concerned, their stress is on the fact that the latter do not accept the Oral Torah.

NÖTSCHER (2216b) summarizes the views of the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes on fate. He notes that Josephus uses four Greek terms for fate – ἀνάγκη, εἰμαρμένη, τύχη, and χρεὼν (we should add πεπωμένη) – which, in his view, have the same meaning and which he identifies with G-d, upon Whom all are dependent.

URBACH (2216c), vol. 1, pp. 255–256, comments on Josephus' view of the sects regarding fate and free will, and concludes that Josephus' formulation represents only a single school of thought, whereas actually there were divergences of view among different authorities at various periods.

## 22.2: The Pharisees: General

- (2217) JEAN-CLAUDE MARGOT: Les pharisiens d'après quelques ouvrages récents. In: *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie* 6, 1956, pp. 294–302.
- (2218) ROBERT TRAVERS HERFORD: *The Pharisees*. New York 1924. Trans. into German by WALTER FISCHER: *Die Pharisäer*. Leipzig 1928; Köln 1961.
- (2219) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu. Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*. Leipzig 1923; 3rd ed., Göttingen 1962. Trans. into French (based on 3rd ed.) by JEAN LEMOYNE: *Jérusalem au temps de Jésus, recherches d'histoire économique et sociale pour la période néotestamentaire*. Paris 1967. Trans. into English (based on 3rd ed.) by F. H. and C. H. CAVE: *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus; An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Philadelphia 1969.
- (2220) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *Jesus of Nazareth (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem 1922. Trans. into English by WILLIAM F. STINESPRING. New York 1925; rpt. 1979.
- (2221) GOTTLÖB SCHRENK: *Rabbinische Charakterköpfe im urchristlichen Zeitalter*. In: *Judaica* 1, 1945, pp. 117–156.

- (2222) MARIE-JOSEPH A. LAGRANGE: *Le judaïsme avant Jésus-Christ*. Paris 1931.
- (2223) JOSEPH BONSIIVEN: *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ*. *Sa Théologie*. 2 vols. Paris 1934–35.
- (2224) OSCAR CULLMAN: *Pharisäens*. In: *Dictionnaire encyclopédique de la Bible*. Vol. 2. Valence 1935. Pp. 381–383.
- (2225) WILLIAM F. ALBRIGHT: *From the Stone Age to Christianity*. Baltimore 1940.
- (2226) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: *Aperçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte*. Paris 1950.
- (2227) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Selected Literature on the Pharisees and the Sadducees* (Ant. xviii. 12–17). Appendix C. In: *Josephus*, vol. 9. *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. Pp. 558–560.
- (2228) HEINRICH PARET: *Über den Pharisäismus des Josephus*. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 29, 1856, pp. 809–844.
- (2229) NORMAN BENTWICH: *Josephus*. Philadelphia 1914. Rpt. Folcroft, Pennsylvania 1976.
- (2230) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: *Josephus*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWS, edd. *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9, 1916, cols. 1934–2000.
- (2231) LOUIS GINZBERG: *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte*. Part 1. New York 1922. (originally published in *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 55, 1911, pp. 666–698; 56, 1912, pp. 33–48, 286–307, 417–448, 546–566, 664–689; 57, 1913, pp. 153–176, 284–313, 394–418, 666–696; 58, 1914, pp. 16–48). Trans. into English by R. MARCUS et al. with two hitherto unpublished chapters: *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (Moreshet Series, 1). New York 1976.
- (2232) YIZHAK ISAAC HALEVY (RABINOWITZ): *Dorot Harishonim* (in Hebrew). Part 1, vol. 3. Berlin 1923.
- (2233) CARL STEUERNAGEL: *Pharisäer*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 19.2, 1938, cols. 1825–1835.
- (2234) MEYER WAXMAN: *A History of Jewish Literature from the Close of the Bible to Our Own Days*. Vol. 1. 2nd ed., New York 1938.
- (2235) SAMUEL S. COHEN: *Pharisaism: A Definition*. In: ABRAHAM BERGER, LAWRENCE MARWICK, ISIDORE S. MEYER, edd., *Joshua Bloch Memorial Volume*. New York 1960. Pp. 65–74.
- (2236) A. MICHEL and JEAN LE MOYNE: *Pharisäens*. In: *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* 39–40, 1964, pp. 1022–1115.
- (2237) TUBIAH TAVYOEMY: *Josephus Flavius* (in Hebrew). In: MOSHEH AUERBACH, ed., *Memorial Volume to Yizhak Isaac Halevy*, Part 1. *Benei Beraq* 1964. Pp. 306–334.
- (2238) RUDOLF MEYER: *Tradition und Neuschöpfung im antiken Judentum*. Dargestellt an der Geschichte des Pharisäismus. In: *Sitzungsberichte der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Bd. 110, Heft 2. Berlin 1965.
- (2239) LOUIS FINKELSTEIN: *The Pharisees: The Sociological Background of Their Faith*. 2 vols. 3rd ed., Philadelphia 1962.
- (2240) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Rise and Fall of the Judaeon State: A Political, Social and Religious History of the Second Commonwealth*. Vol. 2: 37 B.C.E.–66 C.E. Philadelphia 1967.
- (2241) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: *Jesus und die Pharisäer*. Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus. In: *Bibel und Liturgie* 42, 1968, pp. 112–131. Trans. into English (abridged): *Jesus and the Pharisees*. In: *Theology Digest* 17, 1969, pp. 233–240.
- (2242) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.: *Josephus: A Selection from His Works*. New York 1974.
- (2242a) LEO BAECK: *Paulus, die Pharisäer und das Neue Testament*. Frankfurt 1961.
- (2242b) HANS-FRIEDRICH WEISS: *Der Pharisäismus im Lichte der Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments*. In: *Sitzungsberichte der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, Philologisch-historische Klasse*, Bd. 110, Heft 2, 1965, pp. 89–132.

- (2242c) O. ASHER REICHEL: Isaac Halevy (1847–1914): Spokesman and Historian of Jewish Tradition. New York 1969.
- (2242d) ELLIS RIVKIN: Prolegomenon. In rpt. of: WILLIAM O. E. OESTERLEY, ed., *Judaism and Christianity*, 1: The Age of Transition. New York 1969.
- (2242e) DAVID ELLENSON: Ellis Rivkin and the Problems of Pharisaic History: A Study in Historiography. In: *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 43, 1975, pp. 787–802.
- (2242f) ELLIS RIVKIN: *A Hidden Revolution: The Pharisees' Search for the Kingdom Within*. Nashville 1978.
- (2242g) GEORGE W. BUCHANAN: *The Consequences of the Covenant*. Leiden 1970.
- (2242h) ERNST L. EHRLICH: Zur Geschichte der Pharisäer. In: *Freiburger Rundbrief* 29, 1977, pp. 46–52.
- (2242i) MICHAEL J. COOK: Jesus and the Pharisees – The Problem as It Stands Today. In: *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 15, 1978, pp. 441–460.
- (2242j) GEZA VERMES: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. London 1977; Cleveland 1978.
- (2242k) JACOB NEUSNER: The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism: Yavneh (Jamnia) from A.D. 70 to 100. In: WOLFGANG HAASE and HILDEGARD TEMPORINI, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2. 19. 2. Berlin 1979. Pp. 3–42.
- (2242l) P. MAFFUCCI: Il problema storico dei Farisei prima del 70 d. C. *Rassegna critica di un secolo di studi*. In: *Rivista Biblica* 26, 1978, pp. 353–399.
- (2242m) YITZHAK F. BAER: Social Ideas of the Second Jewish Commonwealth. In: *Cahiers d'Histoire Mondiale (Journal of World History)* 11, 1968, pp. 69–91.
- (2242n) OTTO MICHEL: Studien zu Josephus. Apokalyptische Heilsansagen im Bericht des Josephus (BJ 6, 290f., 293–95); ihre Umdeutung bei Josephus. In: *Festschrift Matthew Black*. Edinburgh 1969. Pp. 240–244.
- (2242o) HELGO LINDNER: Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im *Bellum Judaicum*. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage. Leiden 1972.
- (2242p) MARIE DESPINA: Quelques notions sur l'histoire, la doctrine des Pharisiens et leurs rapports avec le Christ. In: *Recontre Chrétiens et Juifs* 43, 1975, pp. 208–233.
- (2242q) LESTER T. WHITELOCKE: *The Development of Jewish Religious Thought in the Inter-Testamental Period*. New York 1976.
- (2242r) MARY KELLY: The Woes against the Scribes and Pharisees. In: *Service Internationale du Documentation Judeo-Chrétienne* 10. 2, 1977, pp. 17–22.
- (2242s) HUGO D. MANTEL: The Sadducees and Pharisees. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, ed., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 99–123, 346–351.
- (2242t) RUDOLF LESZYNSKY: *Die Sadduzäer*. Berlin 1912.
- (2242u) ELLIS RIVKIN: Defining the Pharisees: The Tannaitic Sources. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 40–41, 1969–70, pp. 205–249.
- (2242v) HUGO D. MANTEL: The Development of the Oral Law during the Second Temple Period. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, ed., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 41–64, 325–337.
- (2242w) JACOB NEUSNER: *The Glory of G-d Is Intelligence: Four Lectures on the Role of Intellect in Judaism (Religious Studies Monograph Series, 3)*. Salt Lake City, Utah 1978.
- (2242x) JACOB NEUSNER: *Method and Meaning in Ancient Judaism (Brown Judaic Series, 10)*. Missoula, Montana 1979.
- (2242y) PETER SCHÄFER: Das 'Dogma' von der mündlichen Torah im rabbinischen Judentum. In his: *Studien zur Geschichte und Theologie des rabbinischen Judentums*. Leiden 1978. Pp. 153–197.

- (2242z) STEPHEN WESTERHOLM: *Jesus and Scribal Authority* (Coniectanea Biblica; New Testament Series, 10). Lund 1978 (originally diss., Lund 1978).
- (2242za) JACOB ALLERHAND: *Der historische Hintergrund der 'Sprüche der Väter' und ihre Ethik*. In: *Kairos* 21, 1979, pp. 133–180.
- (2242zb) HANS-FRIEDRICH WEISS: *Pharisäismus und Hellenismus: Zur Darstellung des Judentums im Geschichtswerk des jüdischen Historikers Flavius Josephus*. In: *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* 74, 1979, pp. 421–433.

MARGOT (2217) has a critical review of the treatment of the Pharisees in HERFORD (2218), JEREMIAS (2219), KLAUSNER (2220), SCHRENK (2221), LAGRANGE (2222), BONSIIVEN (2223), CULLMAN (2224), ALBRIGHT (2225), and DUPONT-SOMMER (2226). MARGOT groups these books in three categories: 1) works tending to rehabilitate the Pharisees; 2) Catholic and Protestant positions; and 3) the Pharisees in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

I (2227) have a select bibliography dealing particularly with Josephus' treatment of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

Among the older books, PARET (2228) concludes that Josephus' treatment of the Biblical period has a Pharisaic bias; but we may comment that our own investigation of a number of Biblical personages shows numerous divergences from the Talmud, the repository of Pharisaic wisdom, and much adaptation for a Hellenized audience.

BENTWICH (2229) argues, with some cogency, that Josephus shows at best a superficial understanding of the tenets of the Pharisees, even though he professed to be one of their adherents; we may suggest that apologetic motifs may enter into these distortions.

HÖLSCHER (2230) believes that only the notice in *Antiquities* 18.12–15 shows an appreciation of the Pharisaic point of view.

GINZBERG (2231), pp. 228–229, comments on the value and limitations of Josephus as a source for the ideological differences between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

HALEVY (2232) launches into a tirade against Josephus, who, he says, was not a Pharisee but hated Pharisees and Torah rabbis and hence hardly mentions them. We may reply that Josephus has relatively little to say about them or about other religious movements because he is primarily a historian; moreover, the majority of the Pharisees deliberately removed themselves as much as possible from politics.

STEUERNAGEL (2233), in his presentation of the Pharisees, unfortunately relies almost completely on Josephus and neglects the rabbinic evidence almost totally.

WAXMAN (2234) contends that Josephus' picture of the Pharisees as a cunning sect shows that he is reproducing the bias in his sources; we may reply that inasmuch as we do not have his sources for this period we can merely conjecture. But when we definitely know Josephus' source, as in his restatement of the 'Letter of Aristeeas', we see that he can rework his source with considerable thoroughness. It is hard to believe that in an issue as important as the Pharisees, where he had personal knowledge and experience, he chose slavishly to reproduce his sources.



COHEN (2235) argues that Josephus withholds some vital facts about the Pharisees and colors others to accommodate his Roman patrons and readers. He thus suppresses the Pharisaic beliefs in angels, resurrection of the body (abhorrent to his Greek pagan readers because of the widespread contempt for the body), and the Messiah (which would have been regarded as revolutionary). We may comment that perhaps Josephus does not mention the Pharisaic belief in angels because this would force him to admit that the Sadducees rejected such a belief (Acts 23. 8), and this would have aroused more sympathy for the Sadducees on the part of his rationalistically inclined readers. Moreover, there may well be references to the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection in War 3. 374 and Antiquities 18. 14, as we have noted above. Philo, however, we may note, also makes no reference to the doctrine of resurrection.

MICHEL and LE MOYNE (2236) present a useful overall survey.

TAVYOEMY (2237) bitterly attacks Josephus for placing the Pharisees on the same level as the other sects; but, as we shall note below, the very name 'Pharisee' was probably given to them by their opponents because they were 'Separatists'. Josephus, he says, showed his hatred for the great Pharisaic teachers by his failure to mention them, with almost no exception, by name, and by his omitting their titles of honor when he does mention them; but, we may comment, Josephus in the 'Antiquities' is writing a political and military history and hence has little place for details about religious movements. His long digression about the Essenes in the 'War' (2. 119–161) is presented because their unusual features would undoubtedly intrigue his Greek readers.

MEYER (2238) discusses the origin, historical development, and beliefs of the Pharisees and their relations with the Sadducees.

FINKELSTEN (2239), in a revision of his well-known work which first appeared in 1938, has a lengthy introduction noting recent developments in research and their bearing on his major thesis that the Pharisees should be viewed as a sociological movement. In this new introduction he treats specifically, pp. cxix–cxxii, 'The Description of the Pharisees by Josephus', and argues that Josephus is inaccurate with regard to both the Pharisees and the Sadducees and that he (Josephus) himself usually adopted a Shammaritic interpretation of the Torah and theology, ascribing to all the Pharisees the doctrines that he knew only from his earlier Shammaritic connections. FINKELSTEIN rightly stresses, pp. xlvi–lvi, that Josephus is aware (Ant. 13. 297) that the major difference between the Pharisees and the Sadducees is the latter's rejection of the Oral Torah; but, we may note, this passage does not occur in any of his systematic comparisons of the sects, and hence Josephus conveys the thoroughly misleading impression that the basic difference is in the attitude toward fate. As to Josephus' adopting a Shammaritic position with regard to the laws and theology, there are many points, as noted above, in Josephus where he is not paralleled by the Shammarites, so far as we have their views, and similarly there are many points where known Shammaritic views are not reflected in Josephus.

ZEITLIN (2240), Appendix 3, 'The Sadducees and the Pharisees in the Writings of Josephus', pp. 368–372, merely quotes the relevant passages.

BAUMBACH (2241) argues that Josephus' statement that the Pharisees were the dominant party of Judaism describes their role after the destruction of the Temple rather than at the time of Jesus. We may comment that both Josephus and the Talmud indicate that they had been in existence for a long time and that the Hasmoneans had to reckon with them as the major party in Judaism.

WASSERSTEIN (2242) plausibly conjectures that calculation and a realistic appraisal of his own opportunities played a more important role in Josephus' joining the Pharisees than did faith or doctrine; he apparently realized, we may add, that he could get further with a party that had mass support than he could with the narrowly and aristocratically based Sadducees.

BAECK (2242a) presents a general survey, citing (pp. 91–95) the pertinent texts from Josephus (War 2. 162–166; Ant. 13. 171–173, 13. 289–298, 17. 41–43, 18. 12–15).

WEISS (2242b) frequently refers to Josephus, noting, in particular, his remarks concerning the influence of the Pharisees (Ant. 13. 188, 298, 401; 18. 15) and questioning whether the New Testament accurately represents Pharisaism.

REICHEL (2242c), pp. 69–76, notes that HALEVY (2232) regarded Josephus as prejudiced against the Torah aspect of the Jewish community and the beneficial aspects of the Pharisaic leadership. Josephus' interests, according to Halevy, were with the Sadducees. We may comment, however, that Josephus' own remarks about the Sadducees, such as his view (War 2. 166) that they were boorish and that their influence depends upon their listening to the Pharisees (Ant. 18. 17), were hardly favorable.

RIVKIN (2242d), in his extensive prolegomenon to OESTERLEY, comments on the piety and theology of the Pharisees. In his prolegomenon to LOEWE, he repeats (pp. xxx–xxxiv) his view that the Pharisees came into existence some time after the Hasmonean revolt. He concludes (pp. li–liii) that Josephus deemed the oral Torah as divinely reliable as the written. Josephus, he remarks (pp. lvii–lviii), discounts Hellenistic Judaism and insists that Pharisaic Judaism is the only Judaism to be taken seriously.

ELLENSON (2242e), who is generally not critical, analyzes RIVKIN's methods in approaching the problem of Pharisaic origins. He is convinced by RIVKIN's contention that the non-mention of the Pharisees in the vast post-exilic and Apocryphal literature indicates their non-existence prior to the Hasmonean Revolution. He adds, however, that in light of the fact that the first mention of the concept of the Oral Law appears in a document which can confidently be dated about 80 C.E., it seems odd that RIVKIN did not consider the possibility that the Pharisaic creation of Oral Law emerged at this time instead of two centuries earlier. ELLENSON then concludes that it arose out of the historical crisis connected with the destruction of the Temple in 70. We may comment that ELLENSON seems unaware of elements of Oral Law in such works as the Book of Ruth and the Septuagint long before 70. Moreover, we may remark, the literature from the post-Exilic and Apocryphal periods is very far from vast, and the *argumentum ex silentio* is thus particularly weak. Finally, we may note that Josephus (Ant. 18. 11) speaks of the Pharisees, as well as of the other sects, as having

been in existence since ancient times, and he notes (Ant. 13. 297) that the Oral Law is a major point of division between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.

RIVKIN (2242f), pp. 31–75, systematically presents and analyzes all those passages in which Josephus deals with the Pharisees (though, we may note, he makes nothing of the differences between the Pharisees as depicted in the 'War' and as depicted in the 'Antiquities'. He concludes that Josephus has the following definition of the Pharisees: "The Pharisees were the active protagonists of the Unwritten Law who enjoyed, except for a brief interval, the wholehearted confidence and support of the masses". He then compares this definition with that in the New Testament and in the Talmud. After presenting three different translations of Antiquities 18. 12–17, he insists (pp. 316–324) that the Pharisees were not a sect but a school of thought, since Josephus refers to them as the leading αἰρεσις. Commenting on Antiquities 17. 41–45, he concludes that the Pharisees here are not the sect of the Pharisees, since Herod treats the Pharisaioi punitively and the Pharisees benignly at the same time. We may, however, explain this by noting that the Pharisees had an ambivalent attitude toward the ruling power; the fact that they are singled out for their adherence to ancestral customs shows that they are the Pharisees.

BUCHANAN (2242g) concludes that the Pharisees, like the Essenes, were more like a brotherhood or a monastic order in the Catholic Church than like a major political party in the United States today. The fact that Josephus nowhere suggests that there were any divisions within the Pharisaic group is an indication, according to BUCHANAN, that they were a small group. We may, however, remark that the Talmud clearly indicates divisions within the group, notably between the Hillelites and the Shammaites, and that, in any case, Josephus, as an historian, is not particularly interested in divisions along theological lines.

EHRLICH (2242h), in a general survey, dispels common misconceptions about the Pharisees and contends that the Pharisees were not a political party but a folk movement. Josephus' writings, he says, have the goal of seeking to show the greatness of Judaism; he does this in the language and spirit of Hellenistic-Roman late antiquity by presenting the Pharisees as a philosophic school.

COOK (2242i), comparing Josephus with the Gospels and rabbinic sources on the Pharisees, notes that Josephus, while unusually favorably disposed to the Pharisees (e. g., Ant. 18. 12–17, Life 12), is occasionally less adulatory and even critical (Ant. 12. 408–410, War 1. 110–114).

VERMES (2242j), pp. 119–122, accepts Josephus' portrait of the Pharisees. He cites Josephus' statement (Ant. 17. 42) that the Pharisees were hardly more than 6000 in number and remarks that by no stretch of imagination can they be represented as a large body within the Jewish nation. We may remark that the fact that Josephus says that they were over 6000 in number is a clue to the fact that he regarded them as very influential; the total, we may suggest, may represent merely the number of the Pharisaic leaders.

NEUSNER (2242k), pp. 39–41, notes that Josephus, like the New Testament, does not confuse the scribes, who are a profession and not wholly within the Pharisaic group, and the Pharisees, who are a sect.

MAFFUCCI (2242l) surveys scholarship on the Pharisees from A. GEIGER in 1863 to W. BOUSSET in 1903, from C. G. MONTEFIORE in 1909 to L. FINKELSTEIN in 1938, and from World War II to the present. There is a special excursus on the relationship of the Pharisees to the Dead Sea Sect. MAFFUCCI concludes that it is not possible to compose a consistent picture of the Pharisees by forming a synthesis of references to them in the Talmudic literature, in Josephus, and in the New Testament, and that it is better to concentrate on a single source, notably the Pauline epistles. We may remark that the letters of Paul are hardly the best source, since they have relatively little to say about the doctrines of the Pharisees and since they are generally negative in tone toward them.

BAER (2242m) rejects as unhistorical the allegation that the “ancestral tradition” (παράδοσις τῶν πατέρων), later known as the Oral Torah, had been repealed by despotic rulers because of the disagreements of the rival Pharisees and Sadducees. This sectarianism, he asserts, became prominent only during the last generations before the destruction of the Temple. He similarly discounts the view that the priests played a decisive role in the conduct of affairs of state. The Pharisees, he says, in contradiction to Josephus and the New Testament, as a religio-political party, in reality never existed. We may comment that, on the one hand, BAER disbelieves Josephus’ view of the Pharisees as a religio-political party, but, on the other hand, his statement that sectarianism became rife before the fall of the Temple is dependent upon Josephus’ reports. Josephus says, we may note, that the three philosophies have existed from the most ancient times (Ant. 18. 11).

MICHEL (2242n) insists that Josephus is not to be regarded as unqualifiedly a Pharisee, since he is critical of the Pharisees, since his hermeneutic principles are not merely Pharisaic, since the Pharisees were suspicious of all political power, whereas Josephus, like all priests, sought the approval of those in power, and since his education was not exclusively Pharisaic. We may comment that the term Pharisaic covers a wide spectrum of religious and political positions, rather like the term ‘Roman Catholic’ today. The Pharisees were, moreover, highly self-critical, if we may judge from the Talmud.

LINDNER (2242o) likewise stresses that Josephus’ roots lie not in Pharisaism but in the priesthood, that the fundamental basis of his religious thought was not study of the Torah but the experience of dreams, the significance of which Pharisaism had denied. We may remark that to de-emphasize in Josephus’ thought the importance of the study of the Torah is to disregard Josephus’ own statement (Life 9) expressing his pride that while he was still a lad of only fourteen, the chief priests and leading men of Jerusalem came to consult him on Halakhic matters. It is, moreover, an oversimplification to speak of the Pharisees as denying the significance of dreams, inasmuch as opinions on them were divided. The fact that Hanina ben Isaac could declare (Genesis Rabbah 17. 5) that “a dream is a variety of prophecy”, that Rabbi Joseph could state (Nedarim 8a) that “if one is placed under a ban in a dream, three persons are necessary for lifting the ban”, that a prayer could be composed (and still recited) during the priestly benediction asking G-d that one’s dreams be turned into something beneficial (Berakhoth 55a), and that there were twenty-four professional

interpreters of dreams in Jerusalem (*ibid.*) indicates that they were taken seriously by many, probably by most.

DESPINA (2242p) presents a cursory summary of the history of the Pharisees and their doctrines.

WHITELOCKE (2242q) devotes special attention to surveying the history and teachings of the Pharisees, especially their idea of the world to come.

I have not seen KELLY (2242r). [See *infra*, p. 948.]

MANTEL (2242s) remarks that Josephus, though a great historian, is suspected of using non-Jewish or even anti-Jewish or anti-Pharisaic sources. LESZYNSKY (2242t) denies that the Pharisees were more deeply religious than the Sadducees, but MANTEL points to Josephus' clear statement (War 1. 110), which LEZYNSKY regards as due to anti-Sadducean bias, that the Pharisees excel the rest of the Jews in their observance of religion and as exact exponents of the laws. As to RIVKIN's (2242u) thesis that the Pharisees were scholars and legislators rather than a sect, MANTEL contends that this contradicts Josephus, who calls the Pharisees one of the three philosophies in Judaism and who says that they numbered more than 6000, unless the term refers to a class of scholars and leaders (there could be, we believe, that large a number of scholars). Although Josephus pictures the Pharisees as transmitters of tradition, this does not signify, says MANTEL, in opposition to RIVKIN, that they were formal teachers and legislators. We may however, comment that the Pharisees could hardly have been so influential among the masses, as Josephus (Ant. 18. 15 and 18. 18) claims they were, unless they were teachers.

MANTEL (2242v) notes that Josephus, describing the philosophy of the Pharisees in general terms, ignored the division of the sect into the schools of Hillel and Shammai and failed to indicate the details of Halakhic differences between them. The reason for this failure, we may note, is that Josephus is not writing a book of theology but rather a history.

NEUSNER (2242w) pp. 38–39, notes that Josephus, himself a new adherent of the Pharisees, does not confuse the scribes with the Pharisees. When Josephus does refer to scribes, he does not refer to the Pharisees (e. g., War 1. 648ff.): the Pharisees are a sect, the scribes a profession.

NEUSNER (2242x), pp. 69–70 and 74–75, stresses that while Josephus (War 2. 162–163 and Ant. 13. 171–173) does say that the Pharisees possessed traditions apart from the written Torah, he does not say that the Pharisees have a non-literary tradition. They have a tradition, but this is not the law of Moses: it is besides the law of Moses. Josephus (Ant. 13. 297), he asserts, does not specify oral transmission, let alone oral formulation, of *ipsissima verba*.

SCHÄFER (2242y) follows NEUSNER in his view of the nature of the Oral Torah passed on by the Pharisees.

WESTERHOLM (2242z), pp. 12–16, comments that Josephus' term αἱρεσις (Ant. 13. 171) with reference to the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes, alludes to a philosophical school, as well as to the adoption of a way of life. He asserts that Josephus gives no indication that the Pharisees were interested in ritual purity or tithing, but rather presents them as having broader interests. He, too, follows

NEUSNER in stating that Josephus knows nothing of the rabbinic doctrine of the two Torahs, the one written and the other oral, given by G-d to Moses.

ALLERHAND (2242za), citing War 2. 162–163, asserts that the Pharisees were the continuation of a religio-political, prophetic tradition, rather than a sociological movement.

WEISS (2242zb) says that the question whether Josephus was a Pharisee or a Hellenist cannot be answered on an 'either-or' basis. In any case, he convincingly remarks, Josephus was not primarily a Pharisee but a historian of the Jewish people.

### 22.3: The Pharisees in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities'

- (2243) MORTON SMITH: Palestinian Judaism in the First Century. In: MOSHE DAVIS, ed., *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*. New York 1956. Pp. 67–81. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York 1977. Pp. 183–197.
- (2244) JACOB NEUSNER: Josephus' Pharisees. In: *Ex Orbe Religionum. Studia Geo Widengren Oblata*. Leiden 1972. Pp. 224–244.
- (2245) JACOB NEUSNER: From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1973. Pp. 45–66: Josephus' Pharisees: The Real Administrators of the State.
- (2245a) JACOB NEUSNER: The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70. 3 vols. Leiden 1971.
- (2245b) JACOB NEUSNER: The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70 A.D.: The Problem of Oral Tradition. In: *Kairos* 14, 1972, pp. 57–70.
- (2245c) JACOB NEUSNER: The Glory of G-d Is Intelligence: Four Lectures on the Role of Intellect in Judaism (Religious Studies Monograph Series, 3). Salt Lake City, Utah 1978.
- (2246) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (2246a) HUGO D. MANTEL: The Sadducees and Pharisees. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, ed., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 99–123, 346–351.

SMITH (2243) notes that Pharisees hardly figure in Josephus' account in the 'War' (2. 162–163), but that in the 'Antiquities', written some twenty years later, the Pharisees take first place in the discussion of the Jewish sects. It is in the 'Antiquities', he notes, that the claim is first made that Palestine is ungovernable without Pharisaic support. This shift is due, he says, to a desire to win support from the Romans for the Pharisees against the Sadducees. But, we may comment, the Sadducees had, for practical purposes, lost power with the destruction of the Temple in 70, and hence, when Josephus wrote the 'War' in 75–79, the Pharisees were clearly on their way to becoming the dominant party in Palestine.

NEUSNER (2244) (2245), adopting SMITH's position, concludes that the Pharisees were not the normative sect of pre-70 Palestinian Judaism, and that Josephus is anachronistic and propagandistic in claiming that they predominated before 70. He notes that in the 'War' the Pharisees are a political party, deeply involved in the politics of the Hasmoneans, whereas in the 'Antiquities' they are

placed in a position of nearly absolute power in late Hasmonean times in order to impress the Romans that they could not rule without their support. We may, however, comment that in the 'War' (2. 162) he clearly states that the Pharisees hold first place among the Jews, which surely implies their influential status, and again he says (2. 166) that they cultivate harmony with the community (τὸ κοινόν), which would surely be a reason why the Romans should seek to have them on their side.

NEUSNER (2245a), vol. 1, pp. 137–141, commenting on the difference between War 1. 110–112 and Antiquities 13. 372 regarding the attitude of Alexander Jannaeus and Salome Alexandra toward the Pharisees, remarks that contemporary considerations have everywhere colored his second, detailed version of history. Josephus, he says (vol. 3, pp. 175–179), lends little support to the theory that the Pharisees claimed to possess the Oral Torah dictated by Moses, since he says that it is from 'the fathers' and makes no reference to an oral Torah or to two Torahs. Moreover, all the allegations about traditions from the fathers come only in the 'Antiquities', written in part to persuade the Romans of the Pharisees' merits as rulers of Palestine. As to Antiquities 13. 297–298, he remarks (vol. 3, pp. 163–165) that if we had no preconception about oral traditions, this passage would have led us to such an idea. Josephus, says NEUSNER, does not allege that the oral traditions were laid down by Moses in the very language of Moses; but, we may remark, neither does the Talmud say so.

NEUSNER (2245b) notes that the allegations about traditions from the fathers come only in the 'Antiquities', written after the process of formulation in the Oral Torah had begun at Yavneh, in part in order to persuade the Romans of the Pharisees' merits as rulers of Jewish Palestine. We may, however, remark that the 'War' does not deal with theology, except for the digression in Book 2. As to NEUSNER's contention that the Pharisees in the 'Antiquities' are described as having more power than the Pharisees in the 'War', we may call attention to War 1. 110, which describes the Pharisees as excelling the rest of the Jews in the observance of religion and as exact exponents of the laws. This indicates their religious importance.

NEUSNER (2245c), pp. 14–19, reiterates that in the 'War' the Pharisees are a political party and active in Hasmonean politics, with no indication that they had a massive public following, a claim which first appears in the Antiquities. Strikingly, he notes, Josephus makes no reference to the Pharisees as a party within the revolutionary councils.

COHEN (2246) also stresses that the Pharisees are treated much better in the 'Antiquities' than in the 'War', and that even in vocabulary the 'Antiquities' stress their power and influence much more than does the 'War'. He similarly notes greater hostility toward the Samaritans in the 'Antiquities' and a much more favorable treatment of the high priests in the 'War': such value judgments, we may remark, seem excessive.

MANTEL (2246a), in commenting on SMITH and NEUSNER, contends that the differences in the portrayal of the Pharisees between the 'War' and the 'Antiquities' can be explained as due to the two different classes of readers for whom these works were intended – the 'War' for Jews and the 'Antiquities' for Romans.

Thus the 'War' emphasizes the religious aspect, whereas the 'Antiquities' stresses the political implications; in reality, however, these are two aspects of the same coin. Among Jews, he notes, since the Pharisees were the best exponents of the laws (War 1. 110), they were not only the most popular but also the most reliable rulers.

#### 22.4: The Name, Definition, and Origin of the Pharisees

- (2247) LEO BAECK: The Pharisees. In his: *The Pharisees and Other Essays*. New York 1947. Pp. 3–50.
- (2248) TUBIAH TAVYOEMY: Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: MOSHEH AUERBACH, ed., *Memorial Volume to Yizhak Isaac Halevy (Part 1)*. Benei Beraq 1964. Pp. 306–334.
- (2249) CARL STEUERNAGEL: Pharisäer. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 19.2, 1938, cols. 1825–1835.
- (2250) RUDOLF MEYER: Tradition und Neuschöpfung im antiken Judentum. Dargestellt an der Geschichte des Pharisäismus. Mit einem Beitrag von HANS-FRIEDRICH WEISS: Der Pharisäismus im Lichte der Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments. (Sitzungsberichte der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Bd. 110, Heft 2). Berlin 1965.
- (2251) W. W. BUEHLER: The Pre-Herodian Civil War and Social Debate. Jewish Society in the Period 76–40 B.C. and the Social Factors Contributing to the Rise of the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Diss., Basel 1974.
- (2252) ELLIS RIVKIN: Defining the Pharisees: The Tannaitic Sources. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 40–41, 1969–70, pp. 205–249.
- (2253) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. New York 1953–68.
- (2254) ELLIS RIVKIN: Solomon Zeitlin's Contribution to the Historiography of the Intertestamental Period (Review Essay). In: *Judaism* 14, 1965, pp. 354–367.
- (2255) ELLIS RIVKIN: The Internal City: Judaism and Urbanization. In: *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 5, 1966, pp. 225–240.
- (2256) ELLIS RIVKIN: The Pharisaic Revolution. In: *Perspectives in Jewish Learning* 2 (Chicago), 1966, pp. 26–51.
- (2257) ELLIS RIVKIN: Prolegomenon. In WILLIAM O. E. OESTERLEY and HERBERT M. J. LOEWE, edd., *Judaism and Christianity*. New York 1969. Pp. xi–lxx.
- (2258) ELLIS RIVKIN: Pharisaism and the Crisis of the Individual in the Greco-Roman World. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 61, 1970–71, pp. 27–53. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHEL, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York 1977. Pp. 500–526.
- (2259) ELLIS RIVKIN: A Symposium on the Pharisees. In: *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal* 14.3, June 1967, pp. 32–36.
- (2260) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: A Symposium on the Pharisees. In: *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal* 14.3, June 1967, pp. 36–40.
- (2261) MAX WEBER: *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Religionssoziologie*, vol. 3: *Das Antike Judentum*. Tübingen 1921. Trans. into English by HANS H. GERTH and DON MARTINDALE: *Ancient Judaism*. New York 1952.
- (2262) LOUIS FINKELSTEIN: *The Pharisees: The Sociological Background of Their Faith*. 2 vols. Philadelphia 1938.
- (2263) LOUIS FINKELSTEIN: *The Pharisees: Their Origin and Their Philosophy*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 22, 1929, pp. 185–261.



- (2264) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 9. Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965.
- (2265) ELLIS RIVKIN: A Symposium on the Pharisees (Rejoinder). In: Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal 14.3, June 1967, pp. 40–41.
- (2265a) ELLIS RIVKIN: The Pharisaic Revolution: A Decisive Mutation. In his: The Shaping of Jewish History: A Radical New Interpretation. New York 1971. Pp. 42–83.
- (2265b) PAUL WINTER: Sadduzäer und Pharisäer. In: Kontexte 3, 1966, pp. 43–50.
- (2266) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Rise and Fall of the Judaeen State. Vol. 2. Philadelphia 1968.
- (2267) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Origin of the Pharisees Reaffirmed. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 59, 1968–69, pp. 255–267.
- (2268) LOUIS FINKELSTEIN: The Origin of the Pharisees. In: Conservative Judaism 23.2, Winter 1969, pp. 25–36.
- (2269) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Spurious Interpretations of Rabbinic Sources in the Studies of the Pharisees and Pharisaism. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 65, 1974, pp. 122–135.
- (2270) JOHN BOWKER: Jesus and the Pharisees. Cambridge 1973.
- (2271) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.: Josephus: A Selection from His Works. New York 1974.

BAECK (2247) says that the Pharisees were not a party, school, or sect, as Josephus would have it, but a movement within the Jewish people. Hence the name *Perushim* (Pharisees), “Separatists”, since they were all to become Zealots or to be completely separated as Essenes.

TAVYOEMY (2248) argues that the very name Pharisees which Josephus gives to them is a title of censure, not of praise, and that the fact that he never calls them “Wise Men of Israel”, as they are so often termed in the Talmud, shows his prejudice. We may comment that while it is probably true that the name Pharisees was given them by their opponents, the Sadducees, the name is frequent in the Talmud as well; moreover, to say that Josephus seeks to censure the Pharisees is to neglect several notable passages, especially Antiquities 18. 15, which speaks of the great tribute that the inhabitants of the cities, by practicing the highest ideals both in their way of living and in their discourse, have paid to the excellence (ἀρετῆς) of the Pharisees.

STEUERNAGEL (2249), drawing chiefly on Josephus, dates the Pharisees, whom he identifies with the Asidaei, from about 200 B.C.E. MEYER (2250), who is more critical of Josephus, nonetheless asserts that Pharisaism arose in the second century B.C.E.

I have not seen BUEHLER (2251).

RIVKIN (2252), relying upon the Talmud, denies Josephus’ statement that the Pharisees constituted a sect such as the Essenes and instead defines them as a group of scholars. We may comment that too much stock should not be put in Josephus’ choice of the word αἱρέσεις, “sects” (Ant. 13. 171), for the varieties of Judaism, since this is the normal term in Hellenistic times for a philosophic school (Polybius 5. 93. 8; Diodorus Siculus 2. 29; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Epistula ad Ammaeum 1. 7, etc.), and Josephus is writing for an intelligent Greek audience. Similarly, the term φιλοσοφίαι (Ant. 18. 11) for the religious parties is intended for his Greek readers. To say that they were not a sect but that they were synonymous with Judaism, we may retort, is to belie the archaeological evidence so carefully collected by GOODENOUGH (2253) and which shows that Judaism was hardly a monolithic religion. RIVKIN says that Josephus (Ant. 13. 297 and 408) is

in accord with his presentation of them as scholars; but we may comment that these two passages merely record that the Pharisees transmit an Oral Torah in accordance with the traditions of their ancestors; Josephus nowhere speaks of them as scholars; and, in fact, it is the Sadducees, he says (Ant. 18. 16), who reckon it a virtue to dispute with the teachers of the path of wisdom that they pursue.

RIVKIN (2254), while admiring ZEITLIN's historical method, disagrees with his view that the Pharisees arose during the period of the canonization of the Pentateuch. He associates their emergence with the breakdown of the priestly rule in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and the shift in focus from the Temple to the institution of the synagogue which they created. RIVKIN (2255) (2256) (2257) (2258) (2259) says that only a revolutionary upheaval can account for a new system of exegesis (halakhah, aggadah, and midrash) which has no Biblical prototype, the sudden emergence of a new system of oral laws, a new ruling class, a new shifting of focus from an agriculturally centered society to an urbanized, polis-based society, a new concept of a universal G-d with new names Who seeks converts rather than of a G-d of one people, a new concept of a divine relationship of the individual to G-d unmediated by the nation or by the priesthood, and a new concept of immortality and of the resurrection of the dead. Pharisaism, he says (2258), drew its legal system and thought patterns from the Hellenistic world; but these Hellenistic materials were so interwoven that to this day the Pharisees are believed to have been opponents of Hellenism and defenders of a pure Judaism. Where Rivkin finds a passage in Josephus (Ant. 17. 41–45) which does not depict the Pharisees as the flexible liberals (presumably forerunners of modern Reform Judaism) which he himself envisages them to be, he (2257) asserts that the text (the manuscript tradition of which is unanimous in mentioning the Pharisees by name) refers not to the Pharisees but to a fanatical group of religious separatists. This religious revolution, says RIVKIN, occurred some time between 170 and 140 B. C. E. during the Maccabean revolution.

I (2260) have challenged this thesis, noting that Josephus (Ant. 13. 171) says not that the Pharisees arose but that they were among the schools that existed (ἤσαν) at the time of Jonathan (ca. 160 B.C.E.). In the 'War' (1. 110) they are first mentioned as growing in power in connection with Queen Alexandra (78–69 B.C.E.) and are described, together with the other groups (War 2. 119–166), in connection with the rise of Judas the Galilean, the founder of the Fourth Philosophy (6–9 C.E.). In fact, Josephus (Ant. 18. 11) says explicitly that the three philosophies – Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes – in contrast to the Fourth Philosophy, existed from the most ancient times (ἤσαν ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου). To say, furthermore, that the concept of the oral law associated with the Pharisees (Ant. 13. 297) was an invention of theirs is to disregard the fact that there are 'oral' laws in the Biblical book of Ruth, in the code of the Jewish community of Elephantine of the fifth century B.C.E., and in the changes introduced into the Septuagint which have close parallels in the Talmud. The primacy of the individual goes back to the Bible, especially the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who hold the individual responsible for his own

sins. The doctrine of the soul's immortality and resurrection of the dead may be found in Isaiah 26. 19. As to the synagogue, Ezra (Nehemiah 8. 1–8) already reads the law to the people; moreover, we have inscriptions confirming the existence of synagogues as early as the reign of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221 B.C.E.). The primacy of the study of Torah goes back to Deuteronomy 6. 6–7. Proselytism is a major point of the Book of Ruth and universalism of the prophet Amos. As to RIVKIN's thesis that the religious creativity of the Pharisees is largely a response to the stimulus of urbanization – a revival of the theory of WEBER (2261) and FINKELSTEIN (2262) (2263) of the urban origin of the Pharisees as against the rural associations of the Sadducees –, while it is true that Josephus (Ant. 18. 15) says that the inhabitants of the cities pay tribute to the excellence of the Pharisees, he does not say that the rural inhabitants do not follow them, but rather that they are extremely influential among the masses (τοῖς δήμοις, Ant. 18. 15, not "townsfolk", as I [2264] have wrongly rendered it; τοῖς πλήθεσιν, Ant. 18. 17; so also τῶν δὲ Φαρισαίων τὸ πλήθος σύμμαχον ἔχόντων, Ant. 13. 298). The Talmud, moreover, which is the Pharisaic document par excellence, devotes a tremendous amount of its attention to rural matters. If the Pharisees were urban-oriented, how were they able ultimately, to be sure with difficulty, to win over the peasants of Galilee?

In his response, RIVKIN (2265) asserts that it is in the 'Life', which he calls a propaganda piece, that Josephus asserts that the Pharisees go back to antiquity, whereas in the 'Antiquities', which he calls a solid work of historiography, Josephus does not mention them until he comes to Jonathan. We may comment that if, indeed, RIVKIN puts such high store in the 'Antiquities', he should accept the statement found there (Ant. 18. 11, and not in the 'Life', incidentally) that the movement existed from the most ancient times. He accuses me of not accepting the idea of progress and change in Judaism. That is simply not true: the difference between us is whether these changes were evolutionary or revolutionary.

RIVKIN (2265a), pp. 54ff., summarizes his view on the Pharisaic 'revolution'. Citing especially Antiquities 1. 228–232 on the binding of Isaac, he concludes that since Josephus' deviation inserts a belief in the immortal soul and in its immediate access at death to G-d, his source must have been an oral teaching which took precedence over the literal meaning of the text. Josephus thus testifies to this transformation, though he himself was unsure that a transposition had occurred. RIVKIN, indeed, cites other cases of changes in law and belief. We may comment that such changes may be due to Josephus' eagerness to appeal to his pagan readers, who would have recognized there a Platonic motif. We may note a similar Platonic motif, that death gives liberty to the soul, in Eleazar ben Jair's speech at Masada (War 7. 344).

WINTER (2265b), on the basis of Josephus, contends that the Pharisees arose in the middle of the second century B.C.E.

ZEITLIN (2266) has added an appendix on the Pharisees to his highly original, if idiosyncratic, work in which he argues that Pharisaism arose during the period of the canonization of the Pentateuch in the latter part of the fifth century B.C.E., and that Josephus mentions them at the time that he does only

because he then wishes to introduce the Essenes (Ant. 13. 171–173) or the Fourth Philosophy (War 2. 119–166, Ant. 18. 11–25).

ZEITLIN (2267) reaffirms this thesis, noting that FINKELSTEIN (2268), who formerly believed that the Pharisees came into being during the Hasmonean period, has now recanted and recognizes that they existed as a distinct group as early as the beginning of the fourth century B.C.E.

ZEITLIN (2269) explains that BOWKER's (2270) theory that the Pharisees of Josephus and of the Gospels are not identical with the *Perushim* of the Talmud rests on the failure to distinguish between *Perushim* meaning "Separatists" and *Perushim* as applied to the sages by the Sadducees and other opponents. ZEITLIN notes that the conflict between the Φαρισαῖοι and John Hyrcanus I (Ant. 13. 288–298) is closely paralleled in the Talmud (Kiddushin 66 a), where the *Perushim* hold the views of the Φαρισαῖοι.

WASSERSTEIN (2271) correctly notes that while Josephus is generally very favorably disposed to the Pharisees, he does occasionally speak of them critically, as when he remarks (War 1. 110–112) that the Pharisees took advantage of the ingenuous Queen Alexandra.

## 22.5: The Beliefs and Practices of the Pharisees

- (2272) SOLOMON ZEITLIN : The Pharisees: A Historical Study. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 52, 1961–62, pp. 97–129.
- (2273) LEAH BRONNER: Sects and Separatism During the Second Jewish Commonwealth: A study of the origin of Religious Separatism with special reference to the rise, growth and development of the various Sects, including the Dead Sea Community (originally a thesis for a Master's degree at the University of Witwatersrand, South Africa). New York 1967.
- (2274) JACOB NEUSNER: The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before A.D. 70: The Problem of Oral Transmission. In: Journal of Jewish Studies 22, 1971, pp. 1–18.
- (2275) JUDAH GOLDIN: A Philosophical Session in a Tannaite Academy. In: Traditio 21, 1965, pp. 1–21. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed., Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature. New York 1977. Pp. 366–386.
- (2276) DAVID FLUSSER: The Pharisees and the Pious Men of the Stoa according to Josephus (in Hebrew). In: Iyyun 14, 1963, pp. 318–329.
- (2277) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Abraham the Greek Philosopher in Josephus. In: Transactions of the American Philological Association 99, 1968, pp. 143–156.
- (2278) WILLIAM W. TARN: Hellenistic Civilisation. London 1927, 1930, 1952.
- (2279) JUDAH BERGMANN: Die Stoische Philosophie und die jüdische Frömmigkeit. In: ISMAR ELBOGEN, BENZION KELLERMANN, EUGEN MITTWOCH, edd., Festschrift zu Hermann Cohens siebzigsten Geburtstage. Berlin 1912. Pp. 145–166. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed., Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature. New York 1977. Pp. 1–22.
- (2280) AHARON KAMINKA: Studies in Bible, Talmud, and Rabbinic Literature (in Hebrew). Vol. 2. Tel-Aviv 1951. Pp. 42–69.
- (2281) ARMAND KAMINKA: Les rapports entre le rabbinisme et la philosophie stoïcienne. In: Revue des Études juives 82, 1926, pp. 233–252. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed. Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature. New York 1977. Pp. 23–42.

- (2282) HENRY A. FISCHER: Stoicism. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 409–410.
- (2283) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Rise and Fall of the Judean State*, vol. 1. Philadelphia 1962. Trans. into Hebrew by MEIR ZELTZER: *History of the Second Temple*. Jerusalem 1968.
- (2284) RALPH MARCUS: The Pharisees in the Light of Modern Scholarship. In: *Journal of Religion* 32, 1952, pp. 153–164.
- (2285) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: Pharisaism Reconsidered. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 56, 1965, pp. 337–353.
- (2286) LOUIS FINKELSTEIN: *The Pharisees*. 2 vols. 3rd ed., Philadelphia 1962.
- (2286a) JOSEPH M. BAUMGARTEN: The Unwritten Law in the Pre-Rabbinic Period. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 2, 1972, pp. 7–29.
- (2286b) JACOB NEUSNER: The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70 A.D.: The Problem of Oral Tradition. In: *Kairos* 14, 1972, pp. 57–70.
- (2286c) SHLOMO PINES: A Platonistic Model for Two of Josephus' Accounts of the Doctrine of the Pharisees concerning Providence and Man's Freedom of Action (in Hebrew). In: *Iyyun* 24, 1973, pp. 227–232. Trans. into English in: *Immanuel* 7, 1977, pp. 38–43.
- (2286d) DAVID FLUSSER: Josephus on the Sadducees and Menander. In: *Immanuel* 7, 1977, pp. 61–67.

The Pharisees in the Talmud regard the basic difference between themselves and the Sadducees to be the validity of their oral law. ZEITLIN (2272), seeking to reconcile the Talmud and Josephus (*Ant.* 13. 297), says that both groups accepted the unwritten law, but that the difference was that the Pharisees believed in punishing those who did not observe it, whereas the Sadducees disagreed. A similar point is made by BRONNER (2273), who likewise stresses that both groups recognized the existence of the oral law. Such a view, we may comment, is indeed reconcilable with Josephus' statement that the Sadducees believe that it is not necessary to observe (τηρεῖν) the oral law. We may add that the Sadducees themselves had their own oral law.

NEUSNER (2274) presents a more radical viewpoint. He cites *Antiquities* 13. 297 as evidence that Josephus does not specify oral transmission of the second Torah and concludes that we are not entitled to speak of an Oral Torah because Josephus nowhere states that the Pharisees possessed a non-literary tradition. We may reply that Josephus here contrasts the regulations which have been written down (γεγραμμένα) and are in writing and which also are accepted by the Sadducees with those handed down by former generations (τὰ ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων), which must have been transmitted orally.

GOLDIN (2275) contends that Josephus' description of the Pharisees as being very similar to the Stoics (*Life* 12) is not to be dismissed cavalierly; since, he says, we see that he had an accurate knowledge of the Epicureans (*Ant.* 10. 277–280), we may assume that he had a similar knowledge of the Stoics. We may comment that the passage cited by GOLDIN refers to one tenet of the Epicureans, the exclusion of Providence from human affairs; and we have no reason to believe that Josephus had a full knowledge of the Epicureans.

As to the Stoics, FLUSSER (2276) argues that Josephus did not understand their philosophy; but, as I (2277) have indicated, there are Stoic elements in his reworking of the Biblical narrative. This is not surprising, since, as TARN (2278), p. 290, remarks, the leading philosophy of the Hellenistic world was Stoicism,

and Jewish Palestine was not immune to this. Indeed, BERGMANN (2279) and KAMINKA (2280) (2281) have collected numerous quotations from the Stoics which bear similarities to rabbinic statements; and FISCHER (2282) has seen strong evidence, admittedly controversial, of the Stoic mood in rabbinic ethics and of Stoic rhetorical literary forms in the Talmudic corpus.

As to the views of the Pharisees, ZEITLIN (2283) says that they believed in the immortality of the soul but not in the resurrection of the body; but, as we have noted, War 3. 374, Antiquities 18. 14, and Against Apion 2. 218 refer to the belief in resurrection, which was a central doctrine of the Pharisees.

MARCUS (2284) concludes that the Pharisees (Ant. 18. 12–15) were sincere in their devotion to ritual.

HOENIG (2285) rightly criticizes FINKELSTEIN (2286) for citing Antiquities 13. 294 to support his view that later Pharisees adhered to the Hasidean doctrine of leniency in punishment; there is nothing here (or, we may add, in Antiquities 20. 199, where Josephus refers to the heartlessness of the Sadducees) or in the Talmud pertaining to Hasidean courts.

BAUMGARTEN (2286a) interprets Antiquities 13. 297 to mean that the Pharisaic Halakhah was not written down in the pre-rabbinic period. Josephus, he remarks, not only characterizes the Pharisaic ordinances as written but as handed down by the fathers. Hence, suggests BAUMGARTEN, in the time of Josephus, oral transmission was looked upon as a characteristic medium of Pharisaic tradition.

NEUSNER (2286b), citing War 2. 162–163 and Antiquities 13. 171–173, notes that the Pharisees are referred to as the most accurate interpreters of the laws, but there is no reference to orally transmitted or other external traditions. Josephus, moreover, makes no reference to a Pharisaic claim that the transmission of the Torah derives from Moses, but rather says that it is from “the fathers”. On this, we may note, in view of the chain of tradition enumerated in Avoth 1. 1 from Moses through “the fathers”, that there is no substantial difference. In his later story of John Hyrcanus and the Pharisees, Josephus (Ant. 13. 293ff.) adds a reference to traditions, although without specifying oral transmission, let alone oral formulation of the direct words. The references in Mark 7. 4 and Matthew 15. 2 to the “traditions of the elders” are consistent with Josephus.

PINES (2286c), noting a significant similarity of vocabulary and style between the second-century Apuleius’ account (*De Platone et eius Dogmate* 1. 12. 205–206, 1. 584–586) of the Platonic view of Providence and of man’s limited free will, on the one hand, and the Pharisaic teaching as reported by Josephus (War 2. 162–163 and Ant. 13. 172), on the other hand, concludes that, since Apuleius lived after Josephus, it is probable that Josephus’ source was a good Platonist (possibly Antiochus of Ascalon) whose views were similar to Apuleius’. We may comment that in view of Josephus’ equation of the Sadducees with the Epicureans, which implies the equation of the Pharisees with the Stoics, and in view of the Stoic terminology which others have noted in Josephus, it seems equally likely that Josephus’ source was a Stoic writer.

FLUSSER (2286d) accepts PINES’ suggestion.

## 22.6: The History of the Pharisees: Opposition to Hellenism, to the Hasmonean Kings, and to the Great War against Rome

- (2287) JOHN GRAY: *A History of Jerusalem*. New York 1969.
- (2288) HENRY A. FISCHEL: *Story and History: Observations on Greco-Roman Rhetoric and Pharisaism*. In: *American Oriental Society, Middle West Branch, Semi-Centennial Vol.*, ed. by DENIS SINOR. Bloomington, Indiana 1969. Pp. 57–88. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHEL, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York 1977. Pp. 443–472.
- (2289) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *Greek in Jewish Palestine*. New York 1942.
- (2290) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. New York 1950.
- (2291) GEDALIAH ALLON: *The Attitude of the Pharisees toward Roman Rule and the Herodian Dynasty (in Hebrew)*. In: *Zion* 3, 1938, pp. 300–322. Rpt. in his: *Studies in Jewish History in the Time of the Second Temple, the Mishna, and the Talmud*. Vol. I. Tel-Aviv 1957; 2nd ed., 1967. Pp. 26–47. English trans. in: *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 7, 1961, pp. 53–78.
- (2292) HAIM D. (= HUGO) MANTEL: *The Megillath Ta'anith and the Sects (in Hebrew)*. In: AKIVA GILBOA et al., ed., *Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel in Memory of Zvi Avneri*. Haifa 1970. Pp. 51–70.
- (2293) JOSEPH N. DERENBOURG: *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine, d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques. Première partie: Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu'à Adrien*. Paris 1867.
- (2294) EMIL SCHÜRER: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 vols. 3rd–4th ed., Leipzig 1901–9.
- (2295) TUBIAH TAVYOEMY: *Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew)*. In: MOSHEH AUERBACH, ed., *Memorial Volume to Yizhak Isaac Halevy (Part 1)*. Benei Beraq 1964. Pp. 306–334.
- (2296) BEN-ZION LURIE: *King Jannaeus (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem 1960.
- (2297) CECIL ROTH: *The Pharisees in the Jewish Revolution of 66–73*. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 7, 1962, pp. 63–80.
- (2298) HANS LICHTENSTEIN: *Die Fastenrolle: Eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 8–9, 1931–32, pp. 257–351.
- (2299) CLEMENS THOMA: *Auswirkungen des jüdischen Krieges gegen Rome (66–70/73 n. Chr.) auf das rabbinische Judentum*. In: *Biblische Zeitschrift* 12, 1968, pp. 30–54, 186–210.
- (2299a) HANS LEWY: *New Paths in the Investigation of Jewish Hellenism (in Hebrew)*. In: *Zion* 10, 1945, pp. 197–204.
- (2299b) GEDALIAH ALON, rev. (in Hebrew): SAUL LIEBERMAN, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*. In: *Kiryat Sefer* 20, 1943, pp. 76–95.
- (2299c) JACOB NEUSNER: *The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70*. 3 vols. Leiden 1971.
- (2299d) GEDALYAHU ALON: *The Attitude of the Pharisees to Roman Rule and the House of Herod*. In his: *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*. Trans. from Hebrew by ISRAEL ABRAHAMS. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 18–47 (same as 2291, but with a different English translation).
- (2299e) ERNST L. EHRLICH: *Zur Geschichte der Pharisäer*. In: *Freiburger Rundbrief* 29, 1977, pp. 46–52.

It is often said that the Pharisees were the major opponents of Hellenism in Palestine. GRAY (2287), p. 142, extends this to say that the Pharisees “intensively shunned contact with external powers, often through sheer ignorance, prejudice, and inferiority complex”. The Talmudic passage (Sotah 49

b, Baba Kamma 82 b, Menahoth 64 b) cursing the man who teaches his son Greek wisdom is often cited in support of this view. FISCHER (2288), however, says that the Pharisees may have been the most Hellenized group in Judea and cites, following LIEBERMAN (2289) (2290), numerous motifs from Greco-Roman rhetoric in rabbinic literature. We may comment that the Talmud itself dates the ban on teaching Greek wisdom to the war of Hyrcanus and Aristobulus (63 B.C.E.). The corresponding incident in Josephus (*Ant.* 14. 25–28), which, like the Talmudic passage, also speaks of the deceit which led to the discontinuance of the sacrifice, though it does not speak of the ban on Greek wisdom, is similarly dated. We may, therefore, assume that between Alexander's entry into Palestine in 330 and that time there was no such ban. One wonders how well the ban was enforced in view of the undisputed knowledge of Greek, at least of the language, by the rabbis, as LIEBERMAN especially has shown.

ALLON (2291), pp. 55ff., and MANTEL (2292) argue that it is doubtful that the majority of the Pharisees opposed the Hasmonians, despite the impression created by Josephus; the fact that 'Megillath Ta'anith' records numerous celebrations of Maccabean victories shows that the Pharisees were not antagonistic to the Hasmonians. We may comment, however, that 'Megillath Ta'anith' is a late and often unreliable historical source and that it is quite possibly not Pharisaic in its traditions. ALLON opposes the widespread view, held by DERENBOURG (2293) and SCHÜRER (2294) among others, that Pharisaism was by nature a purely religious movement, in contrast to Sadduceism, which is alleged to be fundamentally political. ALLON generally favors the Talmudic tradition against Josephus, for example in the rabbinic statement (*Kiddushin* 66 a) that the Pharisees opposed Alexander Jannaeus, not, as Josephus would have it, John Hyrcanus (*Ant.* 13. 288–297). As to the House of Herod, he argues that there was a struggle within the Pharisaic camp itself on the attitude that should be adopted toward the House of Herod and the Romans. He concludes that the Pharisees, from the beginning of Roman domination to Agrippa II, opposed Roman rule utterly, but that in Agrippa's reign they underwent a considerable degree of reconciliation with the government, whereupon the Pharisees split, though with a majority still remaining opposed to Roman rule.

TAVYOEMY (2295), pp. 327–330, says that Josephus' account of the Pharisees' opposition to John Hyrcanus shows his prejudice against them. We may comment that the Talmud itself (*Berakhoth* 29 a) quotes the fourth-century rabbi Abaye as stating that Johanan (i.e. John Hyrcanus) is the same as Jannai (i.e. Alexander Jannaeus). Moreover, the charge made against Hyrcanus (*Ant.* 13. 292) that he was unfit to hold the high priesthood because his mother was a captive is repeated in the case of Jannaeus (*Ant.* 13. 372), who, as his son, could have the same charge brought against him. As to Josephus' alleged prejudice, the whole point of Josephus' account is that the Pharisees were slandered by a certain Jonathan, a Sadducee (*Ant.* 13. 293); clearly Josephus' sympathies are with the Pharisees.

LURIE (2296) says that Josephus' account of Alexander Jannaeus' persecution of the Pharisees must be read with caution, since we possess only the Pharisaic account. Josephus' prejudiced portrait is due, he says, to his



source, Nicolaus of Damascus, who confused Jannaeus and the other kings. We may comment that if Nicolaus was prejudiced against Jannaeus, it was not because of such a confusion but rather because of the jealousy harbored by Herod, Nicolaus' patron, against his Hasmonean predecessors. As to Josephus' prejudice against Jannaeus, such a view seems extreme in view of the agreement of Josephus and the Talmud (Berakhoth 29 a) that Jannaeus was originally wicked and later repented.

ROTH (2297) presents the usual picture of the Pharisees as originally quietist and neutral or even averse to the great revolt against Rome in 66 but who came to accept the revolt and then urged the terrorists to be more moderate. When the Zealots seized control, he says, the Pharisees lost their importance, and their leader, Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel, may have been a victim of the reign of terror that followed. If so, we may reply, why is Josephus silent about this when he could have cited this as a striking instance of the tactics of the terrorists, whom he despised? ALLON (2291), however, argues that Josephus is guilty of deliberate falsehood in portraying Rabban Simeon ben Gamaliel and his associates as unwittingly swept up in the revolt or as intending to weaken the terrorists by allying themselves with them in appearance only. On the basis of the festivals instituted by the Pharisaic scholars and listed in 'Megillath Ta'anith' and discussed by LICHTENSTEIN (2298), ALLON deduces that the scholars, at least at the beginning of the war, were allied with the militants. We may comment that the Pharisees, as the party with massive popular support according to Josephus (Ant. 18. 17), undoubtedly were not monolithic in their attitude toward the revolt. The appendix to 'Megillath Ta'anith' gives the author as Eleazar (Eliezer) the son of Hananiah, who, indeed, according to Josephus (War 2. 409), persuaded those who officiated in the Temple to accept no sacrifice from a foreigner, thus laying the foundation for the war. But the attitude of the majority of the Pharisaic leadership was opposed to the war, at least to judge from the Talmud's statement (Giṭṭin 56 a) that the rabbis advised the terrorists to make peace with the Romans, and from the description (*ibid.*) of the escape of the great Pharisaic leader Rabbi Joḥanan ben Zakkai to the Roman general Vespasian.

THOMA (2299) concludes that the Pharisees did not take an active part in the fighting and so suffered least the effects of defeat; but, we may note, the former point rests primarily on the evidence of Josephus, who was eager to build up the Pharisees and to downgrade the revolutionaries in the eyes of the Romans.

LEWY (2299a) defends LIEBERMAN (2289) against the attack of ALON (2299b), who had ascribed to LIEBERMAN a thesis that all the sages in Palestine knew the Greek language and literature – a view which LIEBERMAN had not presented.

NEUSNER (2299c), vol. 3, pp. 304–308, notes that whereas Josephus' Pharisees are important in the reigns of John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus, they drop from the picture after the reign of Salome Alexandra, and that the rabbinic tradition begins where Josephus ends.

ALON (2299d), pp. 26–28, casts doubt on the view, held by most scholars, that Josephus is a reliable source concerning the conflict between John Hyrcanus and the Pharisees and prefers the account of the Talmud (Kiddushin 66a). He concludes that the Pharisees were never in conflict with John Hyrcanus. He notes that the motif that Alexander Jannaeus was disqualified for the priesthood because he was the son of a captive woman (Ant. 13. 372) is also found with regard to Eleazar and John Hyrcanus (Ant. 13. 288–297) and that hence it cannot be trusted; but we may comment that in view of the widespread prevalence of war and slavery, such occurrences might well be common in actuality. ALON similarly distrusts as a folk tradition the view that the earlier Hasmoneans, including John Hyrcanus, were fit rulers and that the later Hasmoneans from Alexander Jannaeus on were wicked. For the same reason ALON distrusts Josephus' statement (Ant. 3. 218) that the Urim and the Thummim ceased to function two hundred years before the composition of the 'Antiquities' (which gives a date shortly after the death of John Hyrcanus), and prefers the Talmudic tradition that the Urim and the Thummim were not functioning throughout the period of the Second Temple. ALON, pp. 27–30, also disagrees with the prevalent view of scholarship that all or most of the Pharisees sided with Hyrcanus and were antagonistic to the Hasmoneans, while the Sadducees favored Aristobulus, since in two passages in the Talmud (Sotah 49b and Menahoth 64b vs. Baba Kamma 82b) it is Hyrcanus' men who sent up swine for the daily sacrifice, thus indicating that the Pharisees did not view Hyrcanus with affection. We may comment that Josephus implies (Ant. 14. 58) that it was Hyrcanus who was outside the city and who thus presumably sent up the swine: hence both the Talmud and Josephus seem to support ALON's position that there was a deliberate attempt on the part of the Pharisees to malign the memory of Hyrcanus.

EHRlich (2299e) accepts Josephus' version of the dispute between the Pharisees and Hyrcanus as due to the fact that he had usurped both the high priesthood and the kingship, for neither of which he was worthy.

## 22.7: The Relationship of the Pharisees to Apocalyptic Groups and to the Dead Sea Sect

- (2300) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Who Crucified Jesus?* New York 1942; 4th ed., 1964. Trans. into Hebrew by JOSEPH BAR-LEV. Jerusalem 1959.
- (2301) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Herod, a Malevolent Maniac. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 54, 1963–64, pp. 1–27.
- (2302) KURT SCHUBERT: A Divided Faith: Jewish Religious Parties and Sects. In: ARNOLD J. TOYNBEE, *The Crucible of Christianity: Judaism, Hellenism and the Historical Background to the Christian Faith*. London 1969. Pp. 77–98.
- (2303) SOLOMON SCHECHTER: *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, Vol. 1. Cambridge 1910.
- (2304) LOUIS GINZBERG: Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte. Part 1. New York 1922 (originally published in *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 55, 1911, pp. 666–698; 56, 1912, pp. 33–48, 286–307, 417–448, 546–566, 664–689; 57,

- 1913, pp. 153–176, 284–313, 394–418, 666–696; 58, 1914, pp. 16–48). Trans. into English by R. MARCUS et al. with two hitherto unpublished chapters: *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (Moreshet Series, 1). New York 1976.
- (2305) MATTHIAS DELCOR: *Le Midrash d'Habacuc*. In: *Revue Biblique* 58, 1951, pp. 521–548.
- (2306) MATTHIAS DELCOR: *Les manuscrits de la mer morte. Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc*. Paris 1951.
- (2307) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *Light on the Cave Scrolls from Rabbinic Sources*. In: *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 20, 1951, pp. 395–404.
- (2308) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: *The Internal Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. In: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 28, 1952, pp. 257–276.
- (2309) CHAIM RABIN: *Qumran Studies*. Oxford 1957.
- (2309a) WAYNE G. ROLLINS: *The New Testament and Apocalyptic*. In: *New Testament Studies* 17, 1970–71, pp. 454–476.
- (2309b) ERNST KÄSEMANN: *Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie*. In: *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 57, 1960, pp. 162–185. Trans. into English: *The Beginnings of Christian Theology*. In: R. W. FUNK, ed., *Apocalypticism*. New York 1969. Pp. 17–46.

ZEITLIN (2300), pp. 96–100, (2301) says that the 6000 Pharisees who refused (Ant. 17. 42) to take an oath of allegiance to the Roman emperor and to Herod were Apocalyptic Pharisees, who stressed the ideas of a supernatural messiah and divine intervention and differed from the Fourth Philosophy only in that the latter believed in the use of arms to achieve their aims. We may comment that the refusal of these Pharisees to take an oath (similarly, we are told in *Antiquities* 15. 370, Pollio the Pharisee and Samaia and most of their disciples refused to take an oath of allegiance to Herod) was due not to their apocalyptic views but rather to their reluctance to utter the name of G-d, as we see in *Ecclesiastes* 8. 2–3, *Ecclesiasticus* 23. 9ff., and Philo (*De Decalogo* 84). We find the same reluctance to take oaths among the Essenes (*War* 2. 135); and hence they, too (Ant. 15. 371), were excused from the oath of allegiance.

SCHUBERT (2302) argues that the thesis that before 70 some of the Pharisees sympathized with apocalyptic sects but that after 70 they abandoned such views should be reversed; we may comment that we do not know enough about the Pharisees' views before 70 to make a judgment, but that certainly after 70 the Talmud indicates that there was a strong wing that had apocalyptic views.

When fragments of the 'Damascus Document', first edited by SCHECHTER (2303) in 1910, were studied by GINZBERG (2304), he concluded that the Halakhah of the sect in all essential details, with the exception of polygamy and marriage with one's niece, represented the Pharisaic point of view and was not due to Sadducean or other heretical influence.

When the Dead Sea Scrolls, which bear a definite relationship to the 'Damascus Document' (confirmed by the discovery of fragments of the 'Damascus Document' at Qumran), were found in 1947, DELCOR (2305) concluded that the Sect was a step in the development of the Pharisees to a hyper-Pharisaism-Essenism. DELCOR (2306) says that the conflict reflected in the Habakkuk Commentary is that between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, who bitterly opposed each other during the time of Alexander Jannaeus, with whom he identifies the Wicked Priest in the Commentary.

LIEBERMAN (2307) agrees that the Qumran covenanters were substantially in agreement with the Pharisees in their legal and ritual observance, though he declines to identify them with any particular group.

ROWLEY (2308) declines to accept the identification with the Pharisees on the ground that the sect, unlike the Pharisees, condemned marriage with a niece and favored a communal life. The most important difference, we may comment, is that the sect had a different calendar from that of the Pharisees; but apparently the Pharisees, as a kind of 'umbrella' group, tolerated considerable differences within themselves, without reading minority views out of the group. While it is true that the Pharisees approved of marriage with a niece, the Talmud, despite its size, is far from complete in recording all minority points of view, and it may be that an opinion to this effect was lost.

RABIN (2309), pp. 53–70, prefers to believe that Josephus' account of the four sects is substantially complete, and he consequently attempts to identify the Dead Sea group with one of them. He declares them a die-hard Pharisaic group who agreed with the Pharisaic doctrine of bodily resurrection and of divine influence in human affairs, but who were opposed to the more flexible ideology introduced by the rabbis. We may comment, as noted above, that Josephus' scheme of the four sects is far from complete, that the Talmud mentions twenty-four sects, and that an attempt to identify the Dead Sea sect with one of Josephus' sects will lead to 'stretching' the views of that group.

ROLLINS (2309a), presenting a critique of KÄSEMANN (2309b), finds the origins of Jewish apocalypticism in the Hasidim of the second century B.C.E., who were the forerunners of the Pharisees and of their left-wing dissidents, the Essenes.

## 22.8: The Influence of the Pharisees (see also 22.3)

- (2310) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. New York 1953–68.
- (2311) JACOB NEUSNER: *A Life of Rabban Yohanan Ben Zakkai ca. 1–80 C.E.* Leiden 1962; 2nd ed., 1970.
- (2312) JOHANN MAIER: *Geschichte der jüdischen Religion*. Berlin 1972.
- (2313) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Judaism, History of, III: Hellenistic Judaism (4th century B.C.E. – 2nd century C.E.)*. In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica (Macropaedia)* 10, 1974, pp. 310–316.
- (2314) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.: *Josephus: A Selection from His Works*. New York 1974.
- (2314a) DAVID GOODBLATT: *The Origins of Roman Recognition of the Palestinian Patriarchate (in Hebrew)*. In: *Mehkarim be-Toledoth 'Am-Yisrael ve-Erez-Yisrael (Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel)* 4, Haifa 1978, pp. 89–102.
- (2314b) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: *Class-Status and Leadership in the World of the Palestinian Sages*. In: *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 2, 1968, pp. 38–74.

Josephus in several places (e.g. *Ant.* 13. 401, 18. 15) notes that the Pharisees were extremely influential among the masses. GOODENOUGH (2310),

followed by NEUSNER (2311), argues that Josephus has exaggerated this and points to the numerous violations of Pharisaic norms with regard to depiction of art objects. We may comment that it is in large part because of their flexibility and 'realism' in such issues as idolatry and the occult, where the Bible seems so strict, that the Pharisees retained their influence. Important Pharisaic principles were that there were times when a disregard of Torah may be its foundation (Menahoth 99 a–b), that it is better that one letter of the Torah be uprooted than that the entire Torah be forgotten by Israel (Temurah 14 b), and that no decree may be imposed on the public unless the majority are able to abide by it ('Avodah Zarah 36 a).

MAIER (2312), pp. 43–79, presents a comprehensive survey, with a good selective bibliography.

The fact, as I (2313) have suggested, that Josephus (Ant. 17. 42) sets the number of Pharisees at merely "more than 6000" at the time of Herod, when the population of Palestine was probably one or two million, indicates that they or their leaders were less numerous and influential than Josephus would have his readers believe. Josephus here contrasts these 6000 with "all the Jewish people" who did take the oath of loyalty to the Emperor and to Herod; and the implication is that the Pharisees were few in number by comparison. Presumably the influence of the Pharisees expanded by Josephus' time, but in Herod's time it was still limited.

WASSERSTEIN (2314) comments that it is possible that to let oneself be guided by Pharisaic rules was as fashionable and as much 'the thing to do' in first-century Judaism as it was to adopt Stoic principles in contemporary Rome; but we may note a major difference, namely that joining the Stoics may have been fashionable among the intelligentsia but that it was hardly so among the masses, whereas Josephus stresses the popularity of the Pharisees among the masses.

GOOBLATT (2314a), stressing Josephus' statements (Ant. 13. 401, 18. 15) that the Pharisees were extremely influential, concludes that the Romans realized that they could not rule the Jews without Pharisaic support, and hence that it was they who appointed Rabban Gamaliel II, a descendant of an important Pharisaic family, as head of the Jewish community. We may comment that if this were so, it would have undermined Gamaliel's influence among the masses by exposing him to the charge of being a stooge of the Romans. Moreover, as GOOBLATT admits, Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel, his father, did participate in the great revolt against the Romans, albeit as a moderate. We may note, however, that the family had ties with the royal dynasty, notably with Agrippa I (Pesahim 88b).

URBACH (2314b) notes that already at the time of John Hyrcanus, according to Josephus (Ant. 13. 288), the Pharisees had great influence among the masses, but that he does not indicate how much influence they had, though it appears that this power did not arise from their political standing.

## 22.9: The Sadducees

- (2315) GERHARD MAIER: *Mensch und freier Wille: Nach den jüdischen Religionsparteien zwischen Ben Sira und Paulus*. Tübingen 1971.
- (2316) JAMES W. PARKES: *The Foundations of Judaism and Christianity*. Chicago 1960.
- (2317) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: *Das Sadduzäerverständnis bei Josephus Flavius und im Neuen Testament*. In: *Kairos* 13, 1971, pp. 17–37.
- (2318) JEAN LE MOYNE: *Les Sadducées*. Paris 1972. (Diss., Institut Catholique de Paris 1969; diss. Sorbonne, Paris 1970).
- (2319) RUDOLF LESZYNSKY: *Die Sadduzäer*. Berlin 1912.
- (2320) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: *Der Sadduzäismus*. Leipzig 1906.
- (2321) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.; *Josephus: A Selection from His Works*. New York 1974.
- (2322) DAVID DAUBE: *Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 22, 1949, pp. 239–264.
- (2323) VICTOR EPPSTEIN: *The Historicity of the Gospel Account of the Cleansing of the Temple*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 55, 1964, pp. 42–58.
- (2324) HUGO (HAIM DOV) MANTEL: *The Dichotomy of Judaism during the Second Temple*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 44, 1973, pp. 55–87.
- (2325) HAIM DOV (= HUGO) MANTEL: *The Megillath Ta'anith and the Sects (in Hebrew)*. In: *Meḥkarim be-Toledoth 'Am-Yisrael ve-Erez-Yisrael (Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel)* 1 (in memory of Zvi Avneri), Haifa 1970, pp. 51–70.
- (2326) VICTOR EPPSTEIN: *When and How the Sadducees Were Excommunicated*. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 85, 1966, pp. 213–224.
- (2326a) BIRGER GERHARDSSON: *Memory and Manuscript; Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Trans. by ERIC J. SHARPE. Diss., Uppsala 1961. Publ. (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, 22): Uppsala 1961, 1964.
- (2326b) HAIM DOV (= HUGO) MANTEL: *An Early Form of Piety (in Hebrew)*. In: A. M. RABELLO, ed., *Festschrift David Kotlar: Studies in Judaism*. Tel-Aviv 1975. Pp. 60–80.
- (2326c) SHLOMO PINES: *A Platonistic Model for Two of Josephus' Accounts of the Doctrine of the Pharisees concerning Providence and Man's Freedom of Action (in Hebrew)*. In: *Iyyun* 24, 1973, pp. 227–232. Trans. into English in: *Immanuel* 7, 1977, pp. 38–43.
- (2326d) DAVID FLUSSER: *Josephus on the Sadducees and Menander*. In: *Immanuel* 7, 1977, pp. 61–67.
- (2326e) ERNST BAMMEL: *Sadduzäer und Sadokiden*. In: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 55, 1979, pp. 107–115.
- (2326f) CHANOKH ALBECK: *On the Controversies of the Pharisees and the Sadducees in Matters concerning the Temple and Temple Practice (in Hebrew)*. In: *Sinai* 52, 1963, pp. 1–8 (= *Torah Sheb'alpeh: Lectures at the Fifth National Meeting for Oral Law*. Jerusalem 1963. Pp. 24–31).
- (2326g) JACK LIGHTSTONE: *Sadducees versus Pharisees: The Tannaitic Sources*. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*, 3 (*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, 12. 3). Leiden 1975. Pp. 206–217.
- (2326h) ELLIS RIVKIN: *Defining the Pharisees: the Tannaitic Sources*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 40–41, 1969–70, pp. 205–249.
- (2326i) HUGO D. MANTEL: *The Sadducees and Pharisees*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People*, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 99–123, 346–351.
- (2326j) HUGO D. MANTEL: *The Development of the Oral Law during the Second Temple Period*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the*

Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 41–64, 325–337.

MAIER (2315), pp. 154–157, argues that Josephus' description of the Sadducees in War 2. 164–165 and Antiquities 13. 171–173 is dependent upon Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus 15. 11–20) as a source for the account of the Sadducean belief in free will. He says that Josephus could do so because the Sadducees of his time appealed to Ben Sira and because the Pharisees viewed Ben Sira as the Sadducees' teacher and spiritual ancestor; hence we have the specific grounds for Ben Sira's exclusion from the canon. We may respond that in view of the brevity of the references to the Sadducees in Josephus and the lack of any direct reference to the views of the Sadducees in Ben Sira, such a theory seems extravagant. Moreover, the Talmud, when discussing whether Ben Sira should be included in the canon, inserts no statement that it should be excluded because of its Sadducean origins. MAIER concludes that free will was a central point of dispute among the Jewish parties; but the Talmud, we may remark, surely presents no such emphasis.

PARKES (2316), pp. 95–103, in a popular account, presents the traditional view that the Sadducees were supporters of the 'Establishment' who had succeeded in producing a working compromise between Judaism and Hellenism; as we have indicated above, there is good reason to believe that the Pharisees had worked out their own *modus vivendi* with Hellenism, though BAUMBACH (2317) goes too far in stating that the Sadducees stood no closer to Hellenism than did the Pharisees.

BAUMBACH (2317) argues that both Josephus and the New Testament are prejudiced against the Sadducees, whereas actually during the time of Jesus they exercised the determining political and religious power in Judea. We may comment that religiously, according to Josephus (Ant. 18. 17), the masses would not tolerate the Sadducees if they would not submit to the formulas of the Pharisees. BAUMBACH, however, is right in denying the widespread thesis that the Sadducees were collaborationists of the Roman regime.

LE MOYNE's (2318) comprehensive work supersedes that of LESZYNSKY (2319). He justly criticizes HÖLSCHER (2320) for adopting Josephus' view that Sadduceeism is a synonym for impiety. He correctly notes, pp. 27–60, that Josephus sometimes speaks critically of the Pharisees and favorably of their enemies (e. g., Ant. 13. 411–413), while he has extremely little about the history of the Sadducees and does not have much sympathy with them.

Inasmuch as Josephus (Life 12) regards the Pharisees as holding views very similar to those of the Stoics, it has generally been assumed that he equated the Sadducees and the Epicureans. WASSERSTEIN (2321) points out that Josephus' depiction (Ant. 18. 16) of the Sadducees as arguing with their teachers and as boorish in their behavior (War 2. 166) accords with the Talmud's picture of the *'Apikoros* (Epicurean) (Nedarim 23a, Sanhedrin 49b, Avoth 2. 19). We may comment that if Josephus really wished to attack the Sadducees in this section he should have openly equated them with the despised Epicureans, and this he does not do.

DAUBE (2322) remarks that the Sadducees had evidently taken over from the Hellenistic schools of philosophy the ideal of working out any problems by unfettered argument and counter-argument. But, we may reply, there is no indication of any special contact between the Sadducees and the Hellenistic schools; and, in any case, even a cursory examination of the Talmud will reveal that the Pharisees were no whit inferior to the Sadducees in skill of disputation.

EPPSTEIN (2323), noting that only one high priest, Hānan ben Hānan, is specifically mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 20. 199) as a Sadducee, concludes that the Temple was not the headquarters of the Sadducees and that they were not, in fact, the party of the sacerdotal establishment. While it is true that Josephus' notices about the Sadducees are brief, we may comment, in support, that at no point does he mention that they had any particular relation with the priesthood or the Temple.

BAUMBACH (2317) discusses the history of the Sadducean high priests, especially as seen in the trial of James the brother of Jesus (Ant. 20. 200); but we may remark that this is the only case of a Sadducean high priest or a trial under Sadducean auspices in Josephus. BAUMBACH argues, nevertheless, that the Sadducees were interested in attaining a relative autonomy and stability of the priestly state-order of Judea for the best interests of the Jews.

MANTEL (2324) similarly argues that the Sadducees were a priestly party centered on the Temple. He states, citing Antiquities 18. 16, that the Sadducees were dogmatists; but the passage, we may remark, implies the very opposite, namely that the Sadducees regard it as a virtue to dispute with their teachers. He suggests that the Dead Sea sect represents a synthesis of the views of the Sadducees and the Pharisees, accepting the Zadokite high priests of the former and the method of exegesis and promulgation of decrees characterizing the latter.

MANTEL (2325) notes that 'Megillath Ta'anith' serves as a corrective to Josephus' statement (Ant. 13. 297, 18. 16) that the Sadducees had no oral law of their own; there is no indication, however, in Josephus, despite MANTEL, that the Sadducees, as 'Megillath Ta'anith' would have it, attributed a human origin to the Torah.

EPPSTEIN (2326) argues that it was not, as is usually thought, the fall of the Temple which accounts for the disappearance of the Sadducees from Jewish life, but that rather it was the Pharisees' expedient of making it impossible for any Jew believing in the Sadducean Halakhah to enter the Temple without incurring the dreaded penalty of extirpation. If so, we may ask why the Pharisees did not arrive earlier at this solution to the threat of the Sadducees. Rather, we may suggest, their decline was gradual, parallel to their loss of political strength and to the increased popularity of the Pharisees. If, as is generally thought, the Sadducees were closely associated with the priesthood, the increasing worldliness of the high priests and the rivalries within the priesthood added to their discrediting.

GERHARDSON (2326a), p. 21, notes that Josephus (Ant. 13. 297), in discussing the Sadducees, shows himself aware of the distinction between the written and the oral Torah.

MANTEL (2326b), after co-ordinating Josephus, the Talmud, and the Book of Judith in their views of the Sadducees, concludes that at the end of the Persian



period there were Jews who looked to the high priest for leadership and opposed the views of the Men of the Great Assembly and whom we may term Sadducees because they go back to the sons of Zadok. Hence the Hasidim, in the first two books of Maccabees, and the Qumran sect, which appears to be the Essenes but has kinship to the Sadducees, did not arise in Hellenistic times, as most scholars say, but in the Persian period.

PINES (2326c) notes that the second sentence of Apuleius' 'De Platone et eius dogmate', 1. 12. 205–206, has no equivalent in Josephus' report on the Pharisees but is paralleled in his sentence discussing the Sadducees.

FLUSSER (2326d) finds it difficult to believe that the Sadducees, as one of the three representative groups of ancient Judaism, rejected all involvement of Providence in human life. He suggests that there is a parallel to Josephus' description of the Sadducees (Ant. 13. 171–173: "All things lie within our decision") in Menander's 'Epitrepontes' Act 5: "Our character is responsible for each man's faring well or badly". Though noting that the terminology and even the order of arguments are the same, he concludes that it is improbable that Josephus was directly influenced by Menander. We may, however, comment that in view of the fact that Menander in the Hellenistic period was in popularity second only to Homer (he is one of only two classical authors quoted in the New Testament [1 Corinthians 15. 33]), this is by no means improbable.

BAMMEL (2326e) notes that Herod brought priestly families from Babylonia and Egypt to Jerusalem and claimed that they were the legitimate sons of Zadok. These priests conferred the term 'Sadducees' upon themselves as a title of honor. Only when the Pharisees became very influential in the first century C.E. did the Sadducees begin to be viewed as an opposing party. In turn, the members of the Qumran community, who referred to themselves as *benei zadok*, responded favorably to Herod's religio-political strategy. We may respond by suggesting that, though the *argumentum ex silentio* is dangerous, it is unlikely that Josephus, who was himself a priest and who had at one time been a Sadducee and who was later so utterly opposed to them, could have left out such an account and would have omitted ridiculing and refuting it.

ALBECK (2326f) asserts that the Sadducees did not believe in the divine revelation of the Torah.

LIGHTSTONE (2326g), in arguing against RIVKIN (2326h), notes that the sources supply no evidence about any quarrel in principle underlying the conflict between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. Appeals by either group to general criteria, such as the Oral Law vs. the Written Law, or exegetical vs. literal interpretation of Scripture, are conspicuously absent. He concludes that the only way to determine the nature of the controversy between the groups before 70 is through the Talmudic corpus.

MANTEL (2326i) argues that those who deny proselytism by the Sadducees disregard Josephus, who declares that John Hyrcanus (Ant. 13. 257ff.), Judah Aristobulus (Ant. 13. 38), and Alexander Jannaeus (Ant. 13. 395–397), all of whom were Sadducees, forcibly converted peoples whom they conquered. We may, however, remark that they may have done so not as Sadducees, whose

banner they presumably joined for reasons of expediency, but as nationalistic kings.

MANTEL (2326j) asserts that Ben Sira's faith in Divine Providence and in reward and punishment does not prove that he was a Pharisee, since these principles are so prominent in the written Scripture that they could hardly have been denied by the Sadducees, despite Josephus' statement to the contrary. We may comment that the very fact that Josephus says that the Sadducees do deny these principles despite their prominence in Scripture would indicate that they did, in fact, do so.

## 22.10: The Essenes in Josephus: Bibliography (see also 2.16)

- (2327) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Essenes. Appendix D. In: Josephus, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London 1965. Pp. 561–563.

I (2327) have a select bibliography, focussing particularly on Josephus' description of the Essenes.

## 22.11: The Texts Pertaining to the Essenes in Josephus

- (2328) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: Les Esséniens. In: *Évidences: Revue publiée sous l'égide de l'American Jewish Committee* (Paris) vol. 7, no. 54, Jan.–Feb. 1956, pp. 19–25; vol. 7, no. 55, March 1956, pp. 27–34; vol. 8, no. 56, April 1956, pp. 11–25; vol. 8, no. 57, May 1956, pp. 9–23; vol. 8, no. 58, June–July 1956, pp. 27–39, 49; vol. 8, no. 59, Aug.–Sept. 1956, pp. 13–27; vol. 8, no. 60, Oct.–Nov. 1956, pp. 25–36.
- (2329) YIGAL YADIN: *The Message of the Scrolls*. New York 1957. Trans. into Spanish by REBECA TRABB: *Los Rollos del Mar Muerto* (Biblioteca Israel; ediciones judías en castellano, vol. 54). Buenos Aires 1959.
- (2330) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: *Les Écrits Esséniens découverts près de la Mer Morte*. Paris 1959; 3rd ed., 1964. Trans. into German by WALTER W. MÜLLER: *Die essenischen Schriften vom Toten Meer*. Tübingen 1960. Trans. into English from 2nd ed. by GÉZA VERMÈS: *The Essene Writings from Qumran*. Oxford 1961.
- (2331) EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE: *The Monks of Qumran as Depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London 1960.
- (2332) ALFRED ADAM: *Antike Berichte über die Essener* (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 182). Berlin 1961.
- (2333) EDMOND B. SZÉKELY: *The Essenes by Josephus and His Contemporaries*. San Diego 1970.
- (2334) PAOLO SACCHI, rev.: LOUIS H. FELDMAN, Josephus, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX. In: *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1967, pp. 152–157.
- (2334a) CHARLES T. FRITSCH: *The Qumrân Community: Its History and Scrolls*. New York 1956.
- (2334b) J. SCHMITT: *L'organisation de l'Église primitive et Qumrân*. In: JOHANNES P. M. VAN DER PLOEG, ed., *La secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme*. Brussels 1959.
- (2334c) DMITRII P. KALLISTOV, ed.: *Chrestomathy on the Ancient History of Greece* (in Russian). Moscow 1964.
- (2334d) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: *Die Essener bei Hippolyt: Hippolyt, Ref. IX 18, 2–28, 2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119–161*. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 8, 1977, pp. 1–41.

- (2334e) KAUFMANN KOHLER: *Essenes*. In: *Jewish Encyclopaedia* 5, 1903, pp. 224–232.
- (2334f) MATTHEW BLACK: *The Account of the Essenes in Hippolytus and Josephus*. In: WILLIAM D. DAVIES and DAVID DAUBE, edd., *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: Studies in Honour of C. H. Dodd*. Cambridge 1956. Pp. 172–175.
- (2334g) MORTON SMITH: *The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 29, 1958, pp. 273–313.

DUPONT-SOMMER (2328), vol. 7, no. 55, pp. 27–34, in a popular article, quotes the passages relating to the Essenes in his own translation and with a considerable commentary.

YADIN (2329), in a popular work, pp. 167–169, 176–182, presents the passages from Josephus in English translation, together with the historical background of the scrolls. He concludes that the resemblances between the descriptions of the Essenes in Josephus and of the sect in the *Commentary on Nahum* are striking.

DUPONT-SOMMER (2330), in his first chapter, presents the passages in Philo (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 75–91; *De Vita Contemplativa* 1; *Hypothetica* 11. 1–18), Josephus, Pliny (5. 73), and Dio Chrysostom (ap. Synesius, *Vita Dionis* [von Arnim, 2, p. 317]) referring to the Essenes with extensive notes, drawing attention to the most important differences between Josephus' and the third-century Hippolytus' descriptions of the Essenes.

SUTCLIFFE (2331) has an appendix, 'Philo and Josephus on the Essenes', pp. 125–127, and presents, pp. 224–237, annotated translations of the passages in Philo and Josephus referring to the Essenes.

ADAM (2332), pp. 22–38, presents the Greek text of the passages in Josephus referring to the Essenes, as well as the Greek and Latin texts of all other known notices about the Essenes and Therapeutae, including the Patristic tradition. He also presents a German translation of the pertinent passages from the Slavonic Josephus. In each case he gives important textual variants, occasional explanatory notes, and select bibliography.

SZÉKELY (2333) presents translations of the passages referring to the Essenes in Josephus and in other primary sources.

SACCI (2334), in the course of his review of my volume in the Loeb Library, challenges my readings at several points concerning the Essenes (*Ant.* 18. 18–22), notably *θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσιν* (18. 19), *μὴ κεκωλύσθαι* (18. 20), and *Δακῶν* (18. 23).

FRITSCH (2334a) has a translation (pp. 97–103) of Josephus' passages pertaining to the Essenes and a discussion (pp. 103–110) of these passages, comparing them with passages in Philo and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He also (p. 24) discusses the relationship of Herod to the Essenes (*Ant.* 15. 373–379).

SCHMITT (2334b) discusses the relevant passages in Josephus, especially those pertaining to the Essenes.

KALLISTOV (2334c) has a selection of passages, in Russian translation, from the Dead Sea Scrolls and from Josephus' discussion of the Essenes (*War* 2. 119ff.). There is a commentary by J. D. AM(O)US(S)IN(E), which co-ordinates these reports with those of Philo and of Pliny the Elder.

BURCHARD (2334d) presents the accounts of the Essenes by Josephus and by Hippolytus in parallel columns and concludes that Hippolytus is probably directly dependent upon Josephus, though he concedes the possibility of a common source. He disagrees with KOHLER (2334e), p. 228, BLACK (2334f), and SMITH (2334g), p. 275, who had contrasted Josephus with Hippolytus and who had regarded Hippolytus as more factual, more accurate in detail, and less colored by prejudice. BURCHARD stresses that Hippolytus is important as the earliest witness to the text of War 2. 119–161.

## 22.12: Josephus' Account of the Essenes: General

- (2335) CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG: *The Essenes, Their History and Doctrines*. London 1864; rpt. 1956.
- (2336) WALTER BAUER: *Essener*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. 4, 1924, cols. 386–430.
- (2337) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Essenes and Messianic Expectations: A Historical Study of the Sects and Ideas During the Second Jewish Commonwealth*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 45, 1954–55, pp. 83–119.
- (2338) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *Second Thoughts on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids 1956, 1961.
- (2339) WALTER BRANT: *Wer war Jesus Christus? Verändern die Schriftrollenfunde vom Toten Meer unser Christusbild?* Stuttgart 1957.
- (2340) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Essenes (in Hebrew)*. In: *Sepher Ha-Doar* 37, no. 28, New York 1957, pp. 48–52.
- (2341) FRANK M. CROSS: *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies*. Garden City, New York 1958, rev. ed. 1961. Trans. into German by KLAUS BANNACH and CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: *Die antike Bibliothek von Qumran und die moderne biblische Wissenschaft*. Neukirchen-Vluyn 1967.
- (2342) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Medieval Mind and the Theological Speculation on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49, 1958–59, pp. 1–34.
- (2343) WERNER FÖRSTER: *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte, 1: Das Judentum Palästinas zur Zeit Jesu und der Apostel*. 3rd ed., Hamburg 1959. Trans. into English by GORDON E. HARRIS: *Palestinian Judaism in New Testament Times*. Edinburgh 1964.
- (2344) OTTO BETZ: *Offenbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 6)*. Tübingen 1960.
- (2345) EUGENIUSZ DĄBROWSKI: *Odkrycia w Qumran Nad Morzem Martwym a Nowy Testament (= The Discoveries at Qumran near the Dead Sea and the New Testament)*. Poznań 1960.
- (2346) JOHANN MAIER: *Die Texte vom Toten Meer*. 2 vols. München 1960.
- (2347) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *King Herod, the Man and His Work (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem 1960. Trans. into German by JEHOSHUA AMIR: *König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk*. Berlin 1968.
- (2348) HENRYK CHYLIŃSKI: *Wykopuliska w Qumran a Pochodzenie Chrześcijaństwa (= The Discourse at Qumran and the Origins of Christianity)*. Warsaw 1961.
- (2349) ROLAND K. HARRISON: *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. London 1961.
- (2350) GÖSTA LINDESKOG: *Esséerna och Kristendomen (= The Essenes and Christianity)*, with German summary. In: *Annales Academiae Regiae Scientiarum Upsaliensis* 5, 1961, pp. 103–147.
- (2351) J. LEYTENS: *Les Esséniens dans l'oeuvre de Flavius Josèphe et dans les Philosophoumena d'Hippolyte de Rome*. Diss., Louvain 1962.

- (2352) MENAHEM MANSOOR: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A College Textbook and a Study Guide*. Leiden 1964.
- (2353) REUBEN KAUFMAN: *Sects and Schisms in Judaism*. New York 1967.
- (2354) MARTIN HENGEL: *Judentum und Hellenismus*. Tübingen 1969; 2nd ed., 1973. Trans. into English by JOHN BOWDEN: *Judaism and Hellenism*. 2 vols. Philadelphia 1974.
- (2355) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *The First Christian Century in Judaism and Christianity: Certainties and Uncertainties*. New York 1969.
- (2356) GERHARD MAIER: *Mensch und freier Wille*. Tübingen 1971.
- (2357) MENAHEM MANSOOR: *Essenes*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 6, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 899–902.
- (2357a) WILFRED L. KNOX: *Pharisaism and Hellenism*. In: HERBERT M. J. LOEWE, ed., *The Contact of Pharisaism with Other Cultures*. London 1937; rpt. New York 1969. Pp. 59–111.
- (2357b) EDWYN R. BEVAN: *The Jews*. In: *Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 9. Cambridge 1951, Pp. 397–436.
- (2357c) FRITZ TAEGER: *Chrisma. Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*. 2 vols. Stuttgart 1957–60.
- (2357d) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *New Testament History*. London 1969; New York 1971.
- (2357e) SHEMARYAHU TALMON: *The New Covenanters of Qumran*. In: *Scientific American* 225, 5, 1971, pp. 73–81.
- (2357f) GEORGIOS GRATSEAS: *The Renewal of Membership in the Essene-Qumran Communities (in modern Greek)*. In: *Deltion Biblikōn Meletōn* 2, 1974, pp. 329–348.
- (2357g) GEORGES ORY: *A la recherche des Esséniens. Essai critique*. Paris 1975.
- (2357h) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: *The Sages. Their Concepts and Beliefs*. 2 vols. Jerusalem 1975.
- (2357i) ERNEST-MARIE LAPEROUSAZ, et. al.: *Qumran et Découvertes au Désert de Juda*. In: HENRI CAZELLES and A. FEUILLET, edd., *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible. Fascicule 51: Qumran-Rabbinique (Littérature)*. Paris 1978. Cols. 737–1014.
- (2357j) MARC PHILONENKO: *L'Âme à l'Étroit*. In: *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*. Paris 1971. Pp. 421–428.
- (2357k) EDWARD EARLE ELLIS: *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 18)*. Tübingen 1978; rpt. Grand Rapids 1978.

GINSBURG (2335), especially pp. 40–53, is still worth consulting after a century.

BAUER (2336) contends that Josephus' as well as Philo's account of the Essenes is marked by a Hellenizing tendency and that, in fact, several of the practices ascribed to them are commonplaces taken from Hellenistic ethnography.

ZEITLIN (2337) summarizes Josephus' discussion of the views and practices of the Essenes at length and regards him as being more reliable than Philo because he lived among them. The Essenes, he says, were individualists interested in saving their own souls and not in helping the people as a whole; but, we may react, Josephus stresses their communal approach to everything.

BRUCE (2338), pp. 125–135, generally is content with merely summarizing Josephus' account, which, he admits, is, for the most part, reliable. He says, nevertheless, that since he went through all three sects within a period of three years (Life 9–12) he could not have acquired a very extended knowledge of the Essenes; but, as we have noted above, he was undoubtedly well acquainted with the Pharisees and the Sadducees before the trial period and thus spent most

of the time with the Essenes; in fact, he says that he lived three years with a certain Bannus, who seems similar to the Essenes, in the wilderness.

BRANT (2339) accepts Josephus' statements about the Essenes on the ground that he had lived among them; but, as we have indicated above, there is some doubt as to how long he lived among them; and, in any case, Bannus, though similar to them, was apparently different from the mainstream of the Essenes.

ZEITLIN (2340) presents a brief introductory survey.

CROSS (2341) says that Josephus distorts the situation in stating (War 2. 124) that the Essenes settled in large numbers in every town, whereas Philo more correctly presents the situation when he says that the Essenes withdrew to the desert. ZEITLIN (2342) disagrees and says that Philo was never in Judea and that his knowledge of the Essenes is mere hearsay. We may recall, first of all, that Philo had been at least once in Judea on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. ZEITLIN misrepresents CROSS as saying that Philo states that the Essenes withdrew to the desert, whereas Josephus represents them as living in cities. The fact is that CROSS also cites Philo's remark (*Hypothetica* 11. 1) that there were Essenes living in many cities. As to the statement that the Essenes settle in large numbers in every town, this would, we must comment, be at variance with the fact that their total is given as "more than four thousand" both by Philo (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 75) and Josephus (*Ant.* 18. 20), hardly a sufficient number to be found in every town, let alone in large numbers.

FÖRSTER (2343) finds Josephus' picture of the Essenes, on the whole, reliable; it is imprecise only to the extent that he has adapted it to the understanding of his Greek readers.

BETZ (2344) deals with Josephus' report of the Essenes' Torah study and political prophecy, as well as their view of the role of the spirit.

I have not seen DĄBROWSKI (2345), who discusses Josephus' account of the Essenes.

MAIER (2346), though commenting on the Dead Sea Scrolls, constantly cites and discusses parallels in Josephus' account of the Essenes.

SCHALIT (2347) uncritically accepts Philo's and Josephus' portrayal of the Essenes as apolitical and as purely quietistic.

CHYLINSKI (2348) frequently cites Josephus in his popular survey.

HARRISON (2349), in his general survey, quotes at length, but with a minimum of comment, Josephus' accounts of the Essenes.

LINDESKOG (2350) concludes that both Philo and Josephus were well informed about the Essenes, but that in view of their Hellenistically educated readers, they omitted certain specifically Jewish features.

I have not seen LEYTENS (2351).

MANSOOR (2352), in a textbook published in outline form, says that in view of the fact that Josephus underwent a probationary period with the Essenes, he may be trusted for external data about them, but that he cannot be regarded as having preserved their secrets. In the absence of other, more direct accounts, such a point, we must say, cannot be determined.

KAUFMAN (2353), pp. 26–28, has a mere uncritical summary.

HENGEL (2354) is sure that there was Hellenistic influence on the Essenes. But, we may comment, this may largely be the Greek veneer placed upon his narrative by Josephus for the sake of his readers.

Just as HENGEL rules out dependence on the Pythagoreans because the Essenes avoided all alien influences, so, we may add, they must have avoided drawing upon Hellenistic laws of association. We may suggest here the possibility that they were indebted for their monastic ideals to the tradition of the Rechabites mentioned by the prophet Jeremiah (35). Finally, even if there was Hellenistic influence on the Essenes, we must recall that Philo and Josephus agree in giving the total number of Essenes as only 4000; despite the great attention given them by Josephus their influence was not great.

SANDMEL (2355), in an eloquent and pleasantly written book, says that when Philo and Josephus disagree, he prefers the partially untrustworthy Josephus, whom he criticizes for equating the sects to Greek philosophic movements, to the totally untrustworthy Philo (who is apologetic and makes everything conform to his pattern of three types of perfection).

MAIER (2356) concludes that Josephus' source for his long account of the Essenes in the 'War' (2. 119–161) was Jewish but not friendly to the Romans, since the phrase *ὁ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμος* (War 2. 152) could have been written only by a Jew. We may comment that this may be due simply to Josephus' editing, inasmuch as the title of the work, at least in NIESE's principal manuscript, P, is very similar, *Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου πρὸς Ῥωμαίους*.

MANSOOR (2357) presents a brief but useful and balanced summary of scholarly opinions.

KNOX (2357a), pp. 90–92, discusses the Hellenic coloring in Josephus' account of the Essenes. He remarks that on close inspection the sober element in Essene religion dwindles to nothing but careless incorporation by Josephus of superficial Gentile observation.

BEVAN (2357b), pp. 424–427, has a brief discussion of the Essenes.

TAEGER (2357c) states that Josephus idealizes the Essenes, though not to such a degree as does Philo, the difference being due to the fact that the great Jewish revolt lay between them.

BRUCE (2357d), pp. 77–87, has a general survey of the Essenes.

TALMON (2357e) comments on Josephus' statement that Essenes who had been expelled into the wilderness would suffer severe hardships and that some would even starve to death. In this detail, says TALMON, though he bases himself on no evidence, Josephus' account, as in many other matters relating to the Essenes, seems to be based on second-hand evidence and should be taken with a grain of salt.

GRATSEAS (2357f) compares what Philo, Josephus, Pliny, and the Dead Sea Scrolls have to say on how the Essenes acquired new members. Those who joined were attracted not so much because they were weary of life and sought a peaceful, structured life-style but because they deliberately chose such a discipline. GRATSEAS discusses the procedure by which people joined the order.

I have not seen ORY (2357g). [See *infra*, p. 951.]

URBACH (2357h), p. 584, comments briefly on the Essene reports in Josephus, and (p. 595) on John the Essene as commander in the war against Rome.

LAPERROUSAZ (2357i) presents an extensive survey of the Qumran discoveries, frequently drawing upon Josephus and dealing with the topography of the places and the history of the researches; the archaeology; the sect, its history, culture, and languages; the literature of Qumran; the Biblical texts, the apocrypha of the Bible, and the Essene literature; the doctrines of the Essenes; and the relation of the Qumran writings to the New Testament.

PHILONENKO (2357j) asserts that Josephus' source for War 2. 152 is IV Esdras 7. 89, where, as in Josephus, we find the notion that heroism has its highest manifestation in an absolute fidelity of the holy souls to the legislator. It is this legislation, according to the Slavonic Josephus, that the Essenes refused to blaspheme.

ELLIS (2357k), p. 91, comments on the Essenes as strict legalists (War 2.143–144).

### 22.13: The Authenticity of Josephus' Account of the Essenes

(2358) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: Les Esséniens dans l'œuvre de Flavius Josèphe. In: *Byzantinoslavica* 13, 1952–53, pp. 1–45, 189–226.

(2359) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: L'Énigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte. Paris 1957. Trans. into English by H. GARNER: *The Riddle of the Scrolls*. London 1958.

(2360) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: Le mythe des Esséniens des origines à la fin du moyen âge. Paris 1958. Trans. into Spanish by Victoriano Imbert: *El Mito de Los Esenios desde los Orígenes hasta el final de la Edad Media*. Madrid 1960.

(2361) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Medieval Mind and the Theological Speculation on the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49, 1958–59, pp. 1–34.

DEL MEDICO (2358) presents the utterly fantastic thesis that Josephus' discussion of the Essenes (War 2. 119–161) was interpolated in the third or fourth century by the same person responsible for the Slavonic Josephus, that Josephus himself never said a word about the Essenes (hence, presumably, *Antiquities* 18. 18–22, as well as the fifteen other references to them scattered through Josephus' works are also interpolations), that, in fact, they never existed, and that the author of the *Philosophumena* invented the name 'Essenes' (hence, presumably, Philo's mentions of the Essenes in *Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 75–91, *De Vita Contemplativa* 1, and *Hypothetica* 8. 11. 1–18 are all forgeries).

DEL MEDICO (2359) reiterates that the passages about the Essenes in Josephus are forged, and asserts that the Essenes never existed; but, recognizing the recurrence of the name 'Essenes' in Philo, he maintains that Philo, who, he claims, could not have had any opportunity to obtain first-hand knowledge about them, invented the name. On this point, however, we may recall that Philo did visit Palestine at least once on a pilgrimage festival, and presumably might have obtained first-hand information about the Essenes then.



DEL MEDICO (2360) reasserts the same hypothesis in a later work, though he is now more precise in stating that the passage about the Essenes in the 'War' was interpolated by a Greek who lived in Italy at the beginning of the third century and who based his interpretation on Hippolytus. He notes that the Hebrew Josippon has all the episodes in which the Essenes figure but that he never mentions them by name; we may, however, remark that he does mention the Essenes but merely translates the name as 'Hasidim'.

ZEITLIN (2361) notes that whereas DEL MEDICO claims that Hegesippus has nothing about the Essenes except in one doubtful passage, actually Hegesippus refers to them in three passages. DEL MEDICO, moreover, asserts that the Slavonic Josephus refers to them only in the account of the three sects, whereas actually there are other references.

#### 22.14: Comparison of the Accounts of the Essenes in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities'

- (2362) MORTON SMITH: Palestinian Judaism in the First Century. In: MOSHE DAVIS, ed., *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*. New York 1956. Pp. 67–81. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHER, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York 1977. Pp. 183–197.
- (2363) MORTON SMITH: The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the *Philosophumena*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 29, 1958, pp. 273–313.
- (2364) HORST R. MOEHRING: Josephus on the Marriage Customs of the Essenes: *Jewish War II*: 119–166 and *Antiquities XVIII*: 11–25. In: ALLEN WIKGREN, ed., *Early Christian Origins*. Chicago 1961. Pp. 120–127.

SMITH (2362) argues that in the 'Antiquities' the Pharisees are far more prominent than they are in the 'War' since Josephus wishes to show the Romans that Palestine could not be governed without the support of the Pharisees. In answer to the question why there is relatively so much attention to the Essenes in the 'War' SMITH replies that Josephus was catering to Roman readers, with whom ascetic philosophers in remote countries enjoyed great popularity. In reply, we may ask whether readers of the 'Antiquities' were so much less interested in asceticism; they were, after all, the same readers, we may assume.

SMITH (2363) notes, upon comparing the account of the Essenes in the *War* 2. 119–161 with that in *Antiquities* 18. 18–22, that the points peculiar to the 'Antiquities' are mostly found in Philo, and conjectures that both Josephus and Philo derived them from a common source. We may recall that, as noted above, there are a number of points where Josephus in the 'Antiquities' parallels Philo; and it, indeed, seems fair to conclude that Josephus either borrowed from Philo or that they both derived their information from a common source.

MOEHRING (2364) unsuccessfully attempts to explain the difference between the accounts of the Essenes in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities' by suggesting that the Thucydidean 'hack' who, he claims, is responsible for most of *Antiquities* 18 (he admits that THACKERAY may be overstating the case when he says that in Books 15 through 19 the assistants have taken over the entire

task) eliminated the erotic elements. But erotic elements, we may note, form only a small part of the account in the 'War'; moreover, a glance at the rest of Book 18, presumably also written by the same Thucydidean 'hack', reveals several erotic strains, notably in the story of Phraataces and his liaison with his mother Thesmusā (18. 39–43) and in the account of Paulina and her lover Decius Mundus (18. 65–80).

## 22.15: The Etymology of the Name Essenes

- (2365) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Essenes and Messianic Expectations: A Historical Study of the Sects and Ideas during the Second Jewish Commonwealth. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 45, 1954–55, pp. 83–119.
- (2366) ZACHARIAS FRANKEL: Die Essäer nach talmudischen Quellen. In: *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 2, 1853, pp. 30–40, 61–73.
- (2367) CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG: *The Essenes, Their History and Doctrines*. London 1864; rpt. 1956.
- (2368) JOSEPH N. DERENBOURG: *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine, d'après les Thalmuds et les autres sources rabbiniques. Première partie: Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu'à Adrien*. Paris 1867.
- (2369) KAUFMANN KOHLER: Essenes. In: *Jewish Encyclopaedia* 5, 1903, pp. 224–232.
- (2370) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: Une étymologie du nom des Esséniens. In: *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 11, 1959, pp. 269–272.
- (2371) GEZA VERMES: Essenes-Therapeutai-Qumran. In: *Revue de Qumran* 2, 1960–61, pp. 97–115.
- (2372) GEZA VERMES: Essenes and Therapeutai. In: *Revue de Qumran* 3, 1961–62, pp. 495–504. Rpt. in: GEZA VERMES, *Post-Biblical Studies*. Leiden 1975. Pp. 30–36.
- (2373) MENAHEM MANSOOR: Essenes. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 6, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 899–902.
- (2374) JOHN LIGHTFOOT: *Descriptio Templi Hierosolymitani*. London 1650.
- (2375) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: 'Faux Prophètes': surnom des Esséniens dans le Sermon sur la Montagne. In: *Revue de Qumran* 7, 1969, pp. 45–79.
- (2376) ADOLF HILGENFELD: Die Essäer des Josephus. In: *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*. Leipzig 1884. Pp. 116–133.
- (2377) BASILIOS VELLAS: Zur Etymologie des Namens Ἐσσηῖται. In: *Zeitschrift für die alt-testamentliche Wissenschaft* 81, 1969, pp. 99–100.
- (2378) ELIESER BEN IEHUDA: *Thesaurus Totius Hebraeae et Veteris et Recentioris* (in Hebrew). 16 vols. Berlin 1908–59.

ZEITLIN (2365) suggests that since Josephus (*Ant.* 3. 163) on Exodus 28. 15 calls the high priest's breastplate (*hōshēn*) ἑσσην, signifying λόγιον (an oracle), he used the name Essene because of the loin cloth, signifying, like the *hōshēn*, the gift of foretelling the future, for which the Essenes were well known. Inasmuch as, we may comment, Philo, at least a generation before Josephus, used the name Ἐσσηῖται (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 75, 91; *De Vita Contemplativa* 1; *Hypothetica* 11. 1, 11. 3, 11. 14), the name appears to have been established before Josephus. The etymology connecting the group with the high priest's breastplate seems unlikely because there is no special connection of the group with the high priesthood or the Temple. ZEITLIN notes that where Josephus has 'Essenes' the paraphrase of Josippon uses the term 'Hasidim' ('the

pious”); and since he dates the book of Josippon in the second or third century, he regards this as evidence that they were known as Hasidim in Jewish circles generally; but, we may reply, inasmuch as Josippon most probably dates from the tenth century, as we have noted above, such evidence is worth little. In thus identifying the Essenes with the Hasidim, ZEITLIN is following FRANKEL (2366), GINSBURG (2367), DERENBOURG (2368), and KOHLER (2369). It seems unlikely, however, we may remark, that the Talmud would call “pious” a group that differed with rest of the Jews in the crucial matters of conduct of sacrifices (Ant. 18. 19) and, in the case of the major wing of the sect, in forbidding marriage; on the latter point, we may recall that Ben Azzai, the one rabbi in the Talmud who never married, was accused of being a murderer because he had failed to perpetuate the race (Yevamoth 63 b). Perhaps they were termed Hasidim by their admirers but certainly not by the Talmudic rabbis. The choice of the term Hasidim, we may add, is mostly an attempt at translating their name by a similar term in Hebrew, perhaps in the awareness of the use of term Hasidim for pietists in this period of the Second Temple.

DEL MEDICO (2370), unaware of ZEITLIN’s article above, independently derives the name of Essenes from *hōshen*, the breastplate of the high priest; but, as we have noted, there is no indication of any special tie between the Essenes and the priests.

VERMES (2371) (2372) derives the name from Aramaic *’aseya*’ (“healer”) and notes that the fourth-century Christian Epiphanius states that the Nazoraeans were at one time called Ἱεσσαῖοι, which he interprets as “healers”. In support of this etymology he cites Josephus’ references to their study of medicine and to their living, for the most part, for over a hundred years. This theory may well connect the Essenes with the Therapeutae, whose name implies a knowledge of medical treatment. Furthermore, VERMES attempts to support this etymology by noting that the noun *merape*’ (“healer”) plays an important part in the Dead Sea Scrolls. MANSOOR (2373) similarly derives the name Essenes from the Aramaic *’isiin* (“healers”). VERMES suggests that the name Essenes represents the popular, not the official, designation by which they were known. This etymology, however, we may comment, attractive as it is, fails to account for the variant spellings Ἱεσσαῖοι and Ἱεσηνοί, both of which are used by Josephus.

Less appealing is the theory espoused by LIGHTFOOT (2374) and KOHLER (2369) deriving the name from the Hebrew *hasha’im* or *hasha’in* (“the silent ones”), referring to their giving of alms in silence and their keeping their teaching silent.

DANIEL (2375) follows the suggestion of HILGENFELD (2376) in deriving the name Ἱεσσαῖος from Hebrew *hōzēh* or, better, Aramaic *hāzōyā*’ and of deriving Ἱεσηνός from Aramaic *hezwānā* (“seer”, “visionary”). We may object, however, that while it is true that the Essenes were renowned seers, they are by no means the only ones who have such a gift in the pages of Josephus, since Josephus himself, for example, claims to have had such a power. To a great degree, DANIEL’s reasoning is circular, since he argues from the fact that the Herodians, whom he equates with the Essenes, were called seers in the New

Testament. Finally, we may object that the shift in sound between *hōzēh* and Ἑσσαῖος is too great.

VELLAS (2377) derives Ἑσσαῖος from Hebrew *ʿesh*, “fire”, “resplendence”, and Ἑσσηνός from *ʿeshin*, the Aramaic plural of *ʿesh*, so that the Essenes are those who are bright or shining. Such a transliteration of the letter *shin* as a double sigma in Greek has a precedent in the Septuagint’s transliteration of Aveshalom (Absalom), for example, by Abessalom. VELLAS points to the fact that the members of the Dead Sea community are called ‘Sons of Light’ in contrast to their opponents, who are called ‘Sons of Darkness’; and, indeed, one of the scrolls deals with the conflict between them. We may comment, however, that *ʿesh* is fire, not light, which is *ʾor* in Hebrew; and though BEN YEHUDA (2378), vol. 1, pp. 112–116, in his exhaustive dictionary, does cite Talmudic passages where *ʾor* is used in the sense of *ʿesh*, he can cite none, vol. 1, pp. 405–401, where *esh* is used in the sense of *ʾor*. There is no passage, we may conclude, in Josephus’ long description of the Essenes in the ‘War’ that indicates a special relationship to fire.

## 22.16: The Origin of the Essenes

- (2379) KAUFMANN KOHLER: Essenes. In: Jewish Encyclopaedia 5, 1903, pp. 224–232.
- (2380) P. HORVATH: The Origin of the Essenes. New York 1964.
- (2381) EMIL SCHÜRER: Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. 3 vols. 3rd–4th ed., Leipzig 1901–9.
- (2382) NORMAN D. BENTWICH: Hellenism. Philadelphia 1919.
- (2383) EDUARD ZELLER: Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Vol. 3.2. 4th ed., Leipzig 1903. Pp. 307–377.
- (2384) ISIDORE LÉVY: La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine (Bibliothèque de l’École des hautes études, no. 250). Paris 1927.
- (2385) FRANZ CUMONT: Esséniens et Pythagoriciens d’après un passage de Josèphe. In: Comptes rendus de l’Académie des inscriptions et des belles lettres, 1930, pp. 99–112.
- (2386) JÉRÔME CARCOPINO: De Pythagore aux Apôtres. Paris 1956.
- (2387) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: Nouveaux Aperçus sur les manuscrits de la mer Morte. Paris 1953.
- (2388) MOSES HADAS: Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion. New York 1959. Trans. into German: Hellenistische Kultur. Stuttgart 1963.
- (2389) GEORG MOLIN: Qumran-Apokalyptik-Essenismus. In: Saeculum 6, 1955, pp. 244–281.
- (2390) ALPHONSE E. TRICOT: Les Esséniens, selon Philon et Josèphe. In: ANDRÉ ROBERT and A. FEUILLET, Introduction à la Bible. Vol. 2: Nouveau Testament. Paris 1959. Pp. 75–77. Trans. into English by EDWARD P. ARBEZ and MARTIN R. P. MCGUIRE, Guide to the Bible: an Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, published under the direction of ANDRÉ ROBERT and ALPHONSE TRICOT. 2 vols. 2nd ed., Paris 1960. Trans. into German by KONSTANZ FASCHIAN: Einleitung in die Heilige Schrift. 2 vols. Wien 1964. Trans. into Spanish by ALEJANDRO ROS: Introducción a la Biblia. 2 vols. Barcelona 1965.
- (2391) HENRI SÉROUYA: Les Esséniens. Paris 1959.
- (2392) MARTIN HENGEL: Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jhrs. v. Chr. Tübingen

1969; 2nd ed., 1973. Trans. into English by JOHN BOWDEN: *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Philadelphia 1974.

- (2392a) J. SCHMITT: *L'organisation de l'Église primitive et Qumrân*. In: JOHANNES P. M. VAN DER PLOEG, ed., *La secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme*. Brussels 1959. Pp. 217–231.
- (2392b) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: *On a Passage of Josephus Relating to the Essenes* (Antiq. XVIII. 22). In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1, 1956, pp. 361–366.
- (2392c) JEAN CARMIGNAC: *Conjecture sur un passage de Flavius Josèphe relatif aux Esséniens*. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 7, 1957, pp. 318–319.
- (2392d) PHILIP DAVIES: *Hasidim in the Maccabean Period*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 28, 1977, pp. 127–140.

Basically two theories have been presented to account for the origins of the Essenes. One theory, as seen, for example, in KOHLER (2379), looks upon the Essenes as a branch of the Pharisees and sees the Pharisees and Essenes as indistinguishable elements in the position of Hasidism in the second century B.C.E.

HORVATH (2380), on the basis of a superficial examination of the War Scroll of the Dead Sea Sect, accepts the thesis of EMMERICK-BRENTANO, a nineteenth-century stigmatized, visionary invalid, tracing the Essenes back to the Hasidim. Just as the Pharisees sundered themselves from the *'am ha-'arez*, the ignorant peasants who were not careful in observing many aspects of the law of purity, so the Essenes separated themselves from the impurities of daily life and, indeed, sought a higher degree of holiness. We may, however, object that there are basic and irreconcilable differences between the positive activity of the Pharisees in the daily life of the masses and the withdrawal of the Essenes, in avoidance of extremes by the Pharisees and the asceticism of the Essenes, and in the Pharisees' belief in resurrection and the Essenes' denial of this tenet.

A second theory, held by such writers as SCHÜRER (2381) and BENTWICH (2382), pp. 104ff., looks upon the Essenes as introducing foreign elements into Judaism. In particular, ZELLER (2383), pp. 307–377, LÉVY (2384), followed by CUMONT (2385), CARCOPINO (2386), DUPONT-SOMMER (2387), pp. 155–156, and HADAS (2388), pp. 194–197 (the last two also see close ties with the Qumran brotherhood), have argued that the Essenes were influenced by the model of Pythagoras and the Pythagorean brotherhood, since the latter also had a communal organization with special restrictions with respect to diet, sex, and dress, and were governed by a strict rule marked by absolute discipline under a leader with emphasis on study and on the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. LÉVY argues that the avenue of this influence was a legendary life of Pythagoras which is now lost but which influenced not only Essenism but also Alexandrian Judaism, Pharisaism, and the Gospels as well.

It is true that Josephus (Ant. 15. 371) says that the Essenes are a group “who follow a way of life taught to the Greeks by Pythagoras”, but, we may comment, we should not believe on this basis that the Essenes borrowed from Pythagoreanism any more than we should that the Pharisees borrowed from Stoicism because Josephus (Life 12) says that they are very similar to the Stoic school; and, indeed, MOLIN (2389) and TRICOT (2390) have noted that the parallels are more apparent than real and that there are basic differences between

the Pythagoreans and the Essenes. We may suggest that the true forerunners of the Essenes are the Nazirites and the Rechabites (Jeremiah 35) of the Bible and that parallels with such apocryphal books as Enoch and with certain rabbinical dicta are closer.

SÉROUYA (2391) adopts an intermediate position: while he is skeptical about attempts to explain the Essenes as a branch of Neopythagoreanism, he is ready to admit that they are characterized by a certain infiltration of Neo-Pythagorean tendencies.

HENGEL (2392) admits that direct dependence of the Essenes upon the Pythagoreans is improbable because the Essenes sought to defend their own Jewish heritage against all alien influence. Some of the alleged influence, he suggests, is the result of the adoption of the legal form of the Hellenistic religious association.

As to the question when the Essenes arose, TRICOT (2390) says that the fact that Herod honored them so highly shows that they must have a longer history than the two hundred years assigned them by Josephus. We may ask why Herod could not have honored them if they were a recent sect. And yet, though Josephus first mentions them (Ant. 13. 171–172), together with the Pharisees and the Sadducees, at the time of Jonathan (160–143 B.C.E.), as noted above in connection with the problem of the date of the origin of the Pharisees, Josephus does not say that the sects arose at the time but that they then existed (ἦσαν). Elsewhere (Ant. 18. 11) he states that the three sects, in contrast to the Fourth Philosophy, existed from the most ancient times (ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου). Finally, we may mention that Pliny (Naturalis Historia 5. 73), though presumably deriving his information at second-hand and being guilty of romanticizing the exotic, nonetheless remarks that the Essenes have existed through thousands of ages (*per saeculorum milia*), a statement hard to believe if they arose as recently as the second century B.C.E.

SCHMITT (2392a) disagrees with DUPONT-SOMMER (2392b) and CARMIGNAC (2392c) and says that πλεῖστοι (Ant. 18. 22) does not equal *rabim*. He notes that the word is missing in the Latin version.

DAVIES (2392d) refuses to accept HENGEL's (2392) view that the Hasidim were forerunners of the Essenes. The Hasidim, he says, were not a sect. We may suggest that perhaps Josephus omits them because they were simply a religious group, whereas he is writing a political history and thus includes only those groups that had some political point of view and importance.

## 22.17: Josephus' Relationship to Other Sources for the Essenes: Philo, the 'Sibylline Oracles', Hippolytus (see also 27.11)

(2393) FRANÓS H. COLSON, ed. and trans.: Philo, vol. 9 (Loeb Classical Library). London 1941.

(2394) MENAHEM (EDMUND) STEIN: The Relationship between Jewish, Greek, and Roman Cultures (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1970.

- (2395) BENT NOACK: Are the Essenes Referred to in the Sibylline Oracles? In: *Studia Theologica* 17, 1963, pp. 90–102.
- (2395a) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: Solin et les Esséniens. Remarques à propos d'une source négligée. In: *Revue Biblique* 74, 1967, pp. 392–407.
- (2395b) ANTONIO V. NAZZARO: *Recenti studi filoniani (1963–70)*. Napoli s.a. [1973].
- (2395c) ISIDORE LÉVY: *La Légende de Pythagore de Grèce en Palestine*. Paris 1927.
- (2395d) ISIDORE LÉVY: *Recherches esséniennes et pythagoriciennes (Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain, 1)*. Genève–Paris 1965.
- (2395e) GEORG KLINZING: *Die Umdeutung des Kultes in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, Bd. 7) (Revision of the author's thesis: Heidelberg 1967)*. Göttingen 1971.
- (2395f) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt. Ref. IX 18, 2–28,2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119–161. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 8, 1977, pp. 1–41.
- (2395g) J. H. ULRICHSEN: Troen på et liv etter døden: Qumrantekstene (in Norwegian: = Belief in a Life after Death in the Qumran Texts). In: *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 78, 1977, pp. 151–163.
- (2395h) JEAN DANÉLOU: *Philon d'Alexandrie*. Paris 1958.

COLSON (2393), pp. 514–516, in comparing the accounts of the Essenes in Philo (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber* Sit 75–91 and *Hypothetica* 11. 1–18) and Josephus (*War* 2. 119–161), concludes that Josephus confirms practically all the points mentioned by Philo but goes into far more detail. This, we may add, would indicate a common source. COLSON suggests that Philo's reference to the unnamed cruel hypocritical potentates who were unable to lay a charge against the Essenes and who ended by extolling them is a reference to Herod, who (*Ant.* 15. 372) held the Essenes in special honor. We may comment that it seems plausible enough that Herod is included in Philo's reference, but we may add that whereas Josephus (*Ant.* 15. 373) says that Herod was particularly impressed with their ability to foretell the future, Philo (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber* Sit 91) remarks that the potentates were impressed with their communal needs and their sense of fellowship.

STEIN (2394), pp. 29–35, concludes that Josephus used Philo as a source on the Essenes because the language is so similar.

NOACK (2395) notes that *War* 2. 129 says that the Essenes bathe in cold waters; both the words and, in particular, the plural are also found in *Sibylline Oracles* 3. 593; moreover, the 'Sibylline Oracles' are in agreement with Josephus' presumption that the bathings occur daily and similarly speak of ablutions as purifications. As to the discrepancy between the statement in the *Sibylline Oracles* 3. 592 that the ablutions take place early in the morning immediately upon arising and Josephus' statement (*War* 2. 129) that the first ablutions take place after five hours of work, NOACK suggests that Josephus does not give us a complete survey of all the ablutions; but, we may comment, it would seem strange for Josephus, in such a detailed account, to omit such an important feature in the Essene life-style.

When, however, NOACK points to a parallel between the 'Sibylline Oracles' (4. 21–30) abhorrence of animal sacrifices and Josephus' statement (*Ant.* 18. 19) that the Essenes do not sacrifice, he is guilty of misreading Josephus, who, even if we emend the text to οὐκ ἐπιτελοῦσι, still speaks of the Essenes' sending of-

ferings to the Temple. In any case, Josephus is not saying that the Essenes disapproved of animal sacrifices but only, as with the prophets, that they should not be a substitute for piety. NOACK wisely concludes that the concepts that remind us of the Essenes, such as ablutions, prayer, piety, and consciousness of sin, are not distinctive with them but are rather the very core of normative Judaism. Moreover, he says, we may speak of the influence of the Essenes on the 'Oracles' without necessarily saying that this influence can be traced back to Qumran.

BURCHARD (2395a) notes the difference between Philo and Josephus, on the one hand, and Solinus, a pagan author of the third or fourth century C.E., on the other hand, the latter of whom describes the Essenes in a passage partly dependent upon Pliny (Natural History 5. 73) but containing the unparalleled detail that if a person should seek admission who has a fault he is miraculously debarred. He concludes that Solinus' passage tends to confirm the identity of the Essenes of Philo, Josephus, Pliny, and Dio with the Dead Sea Sect.

NAZZARO (2395b), pp. 76–77, comments on LÉVY (2395c) (2395d). He remarks, pp. 77–79, on the relationship of Josephus to Philo's reports on the Essenes and the Therapeutae.

KLINZING (2395e), pp. 44–49, comments on the documents pertaining to the Essenes in Philo and in Josephus.

BURCHARD (2395f), after setting forth side by side the texts on the Essenes of Hippolytus ('Refutatio Omnium Haeresium') and of Josephus, notes two traditions in Hippolytus (9.25. 2 and 9.26. 1–2) which do not come from Josephus or from his source. So far as he did use Josephus, Hippolytus employed a text similar to that of our present manuscripts. However, Hippolytus christianized certain details so that his narrative might be more useful to the Christian-Jewish debate of his age. BURCHARD suggests that a further study of the changes made by Hippolytus will serve to illuminate the history of the Church in his period.

ULRICHSEN (2395g) concludes that Hippolytus (Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 9. 27) has a more accurate account than does Josephus (War 2. 154–158) of the beliefs of the Essenes concerning resurrection and the immortality of the soul, as seen in the texts of the Qumran sect, with which he identifies the Essenes.

DANIÉLOU (2395h), pp. 42–57, notes the correspondence between Philo and Josephus in their discussions of the Essenes.

## 22.18: Beliefs and Practices of the Essenes: General

- (2396) HERBERT BRAUN: Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus. Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte. 2 vols. Tübingen 1957.
- (2397) JACOB LICHT: The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll. In: Israel Exploration Journal 6, 1956, pp. 1–13, 89–101.
- (2398) JACOB LICHT: The Thanksgiving Scroll: A Scroll from the Wilderness of Judaea: Text, Introduction, Commentary, and Glossary (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1957.



- (2399) JOHANNES P. M. VAN DER PLOEG: Vondsten in de Woestijn van Juda. Utrecht 1957. Trans. into English by KEVIN SMYTH: *The Excavations at Qumran: a Survey of the Judean Brotherhood and Its Ideas*. London 1958.
- (2400) ALFRED MARX: Y a-t-il une prédestination à Qumrân? In: *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1967, pp. 163–181.
- (2401) MENAHEM M. BRAYER: Psychosomatics, Hermetic Medicine, and Dream Interpretation in the Qumran Literature (Psychological and Exegetical Considerations). In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 60, 1969–70, pp. 112–127, 213–230.
- (2402) MORDECAI MARGALIOTH (= MARGULIES), ed.: *Sefer Ha-Razim*. Jerusalem 1966.
- (2403) JOHANNES P. M. VAN DER PLOEG: The Belief in Immortality in the Writings of Qumrân. In: *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 18, 1961, pp. 118–124.
- (2404) GEORGE W. E. NICKELSBURG: *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Diss., Th. D., Harvard University Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. 1967. Publ.: Cambridge, Mass. 1972.
- (2405) MOSES HADAS: *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion*. New York 1959. Trans. into German: *Hellenistische Kultur*. Stuttgart 1963.
- (2406) PIERRE GRELOT: L'Eschatologie des Esséniens et le Livre d'Hénoch. In: *Revue de Qumran* 1, 1958–59, pp. 113–131.
- (2406a) HANS-J. SCHOEPS: *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Tübingen 1950.
- (2406b) PAUL HOFFMANN: *Die Toten in Christus. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, n. F., Bd. 2; revision of diss., Munich 1959: Der Christ zwischen Tod und Auferstehung nach der Auffassung des Paulus)*. Münster 1966.
- (2406c) AUGUST STROBEL: Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neu gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften: 45. Zur kalendarisch-chronologischen Einordnung der Qumrân-Essener. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 86, 1961, pp. 179–184.
- (2406d) MARCELLO DEL VERME: *Comunione e condivisione dei beni. Chiesa primitiva e giudaismo esseno-qumranico a confronto*. Brescia 1977.
- (2406e) ROY A. ROSENBERG: Who Is the More ḥaṣṣedeq? In: *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 36, 1968, pp. 118–122.
- (2406f) JAN BUITKAMP: *Die Auferstehungsvorstellungen in den Qumrantexten und ihr alttestamentlicher, apokryphischer pseudepigraphischer und rabbinischer Hintergrund*. Diss., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen 1964.

BRAUN (2396), especially vol. 1, pp. 67–89, has a good table systematically comparing, in four columns, Philo, Josephus, the Dead Sea Manual of Discipline, and the Habakkuk Commentary in cultic practices. He remarks that Josephus is tendentious in presenting a dualistic strain in Essenism.

LICHT (2397) (2398) concludes that if Josephus insists on the doctrine of predestination among the Essenes, he suggests only the possibility of arriving at the subject from the point of view of dualism.

VAN DER PLOEG (2399) says that Josephus speaks of the fatalism of the Essenes for his non-Jewish readers, and that his language is as inexact as when he speaks, addressing readers who do not know Hebrew, of Moses writing hexameters. But, we may comment, the analogy is hardly appropriate, since the doctrine of blind fate was known among the Jews.

MARX (2400), comparing the statement of Josephus that the Essenes were fatalists with the fact that in Qumran there was punishment, implies that there was a free decision on the part of each individual. But, we may comment, at

Geneva under CALVIN in the sixteenth century, there was a belief in predestination, and yet people were punished. MARX concludes that it is preferable to speak of grace rather than of predestination at Qumran; but, we may comment, this may merely show that the Qumran sect were not Essenes.

BRAYER (2401) points to a number of similarities among the Dead Sea Sect, the Essenes, and the Therapeutae, all of which groups engaged in mysticism and popular medicine, angelology and demonology, astrological prognostication, and apotropaic and occult symbolism, on the eclectic foundation of Jewish, Persian, and Greek beliefs. In particular, he points to the reliance on dreams. We may comment that the occult is not restricted to the sects in Judaism; rather, there is a strong strain of it in Talmudic and in popular Judaism, as MARGALIOTH (2402) has shown.

VAN DER PLOEG (2403) contends that since Josephus wrote for Gentile readers, his description of the Essene belief in immortality is to be taken *cum grano salis*. But, we may comment, in their theological doctrines the Essenes are generally close to the Pharisees, who had a strong belief in immortality; and, in any case, there is no evidence in any of the other sources contradicting Josephus' statement about the Essenes' belief. We may ask, moreover, how Josephus could compare the Essenes with the Pythagoreans (Ant. 15. 371) if they did not share the belief in immortality, a cardinal Pythagorean tenet. Finally, we may ask how Josephus as a Pharisee could have written so favorably about the Essenes if they did not believe in immortality of the soul, in view of the unanimous opinion of the Talmud's Pharisaic rabbis (with whom Josephus identifies himself) that the soul continues to exist after death.

NICKELSBURG (2404), as a result of an analysis of the passages in Josephus and Hippolytus, concludes that they had a common source which attributed the belief in the immortality of the soul to the Essenes, and that this further supports an identification of the Qumran sect with the Essenes.

HADAS (2405) interprets Josephus' statement (War 2. 155) that the Essenes shared with the Greeks the belief in a place beyond the ocean where virtuous souls are rewarded to indicate that the Essenes derived it from the pagans; but Josephus says, in the following section, that the "Greeks seem to me" to have had the same conception, thus showing that this is his attempt to equate the two, presumably for the sake of his non-Jewish readers.

GRELOT (2406) argues that Josephus in War 2. 154–158, notably in his use of Pythagorean terminology and in his omission of the perspective of Divine Judgment and of Messianic belief, adapted his account of the eschatology of the Essenes to suit his Greek audience; but, we may remark, such an *argumentum ex silentio*, particularly in view of the selective nature of Josephus' account, is dangerous.

SCHOEPS (2406a), p. 100, comments that the Essenes' knowledge and etymology of the secret names of angels is paralleled by that of the Judeo-Christians in the Pseudo-Clementine work.

HOFFMANN (2406b), p. 133, remarks that the dualistic division between body and soul which Josephus ascribes to the Essenes is not found in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

STROBEL (2406c) cites evidence that the Essenes' solar revision of the calendar was introduced about 150 B. C.E., deducing this from the fact that the Essenes are first mentioned by Josephus at the time of Jonathan the Hasmonean.

DEL VERME (2406d) examines the reports of the community of goods of the Essenes in Philo and in Josephus and of the Qumran community, which he differentiates from the Essenes. He contends that Philo and Josephus presented the communism of the Essenes as the basis of their virtue in order to demonstrate the superiority of the Jews over the Greeks.

ROSENBERG (2406e) notes that some of the Essenes called the priestly Messiah Melkişedeq, who, according to Josephus (War 6. 438), was the first priest of G-d and who had built a temple and called the city where it was located Jerusalem.

BUITKAMP (2406f), pp. 48–52, comments on the Essene belief in the world to come as reported by Josephus (War 2. 154–158, Ant. 18. 18) and by Hippolytus (Refutatio Omnium Haeresium 9. 27). He concludes that Josephus' presentation is not utterly reliable.

## 22.19: The Attitude of the Essenes toward the Temple and Sacrifices

- (2407) JOSEPH M. BAUMGARTEN: Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarrians of the Dead Sea (Qumrân) Scrolls. In: Harvard Theological Review 46, 1953, pp. 141–159.
- (2408) JOHANNES VAN DER PLOEG: The Meals of the Essenes. In: Journal of Semitic Studies 2, 1957, pp. 163–175.
- (2409) DAVID H. WALLACE: The Essenes and Temple Sacrifice. In: Theologische Zeitschrift 13, 1957, pp. 335–338.
- (2410) FRANK M. CROSS: The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. Garden City, New York 1958; rev. ed. 1961.
- (2411) KURT SCHUBERT: Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer. Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehren. München 1958. Trans. into English by JOHN W. DOBERSTEIN: The Dead Sea Community: Its Origin and Teachings. London 1959.
- (2412) JOHN STRUGNELL: Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: Antiquities XVIII. 18–22. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 77, 1958, pp. 106–115.
- (2413) J. C. ITURBE: Jerusalén y el Templo del Señor en los Manuscritos de Qumrân y en el Nuevo Testamento. In: Sacra Pagina: Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Internationalis Catholici de Re Biblica. Paris and Gembloux 1959 (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 2, 1959, pp. 28–46).
- (2414) MARTINUS A. BEEK: Hasidic Conceptions of Kingship in the Maccabean Period (Studies in the History of Religions; Supplements to Numen 4: The Sacral Kingship). Leiden 1959. Pp. 349–355.
- (2415) WALTER F. SMITH: A Study of the Zadokite High Priesthood within the Graeco-Roman Age: From Simeon the Just to the High Priests Appointed by Herod the Great. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1961.
- (2416) EUGEN RUCKSTUHL: Die Chronologie des Letzten Mahles und des Leidens Jesu. Einsiedeln 1963. Trans. into English by VICTOR J. DRAPELA: Chronology of the Last Days of Jesus: A Critical Study. New York 1965.
- (2417) SOLOMON H. STECKOLL: The Qumran Sect in Relation to the Temple of Leontopolis. In: Revue de Qumran 6, 1967–69, pp. 55–69.
- (2418) ROGER T. BECKWITH: The Qumran Calendar and the Sacrifices of the Essenes. In: Revue de Qumran 7, 1971, pp. 587–591.

- (2418a) ELIAS M. BICKERMAN: The Altars of Gentiles. A Note on the Jewish 'ius sacrum'. In: *Revue Internationale des Droits et de l'Antiquité*, Ser. 3. 5, 1958, pp. 137–164.
- (2418b) MATTHEW BLACK: *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*. New York 1961. Pp. 39–42.
- (2418c) JOHANNES BIHLER: Die Stephanusgeschichte, im Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte (Münchener theologische Studien. I. Historische Abteilung, 16. Bd.). München 1963.
- (2418d) GEORG KLINZING: Die Umdeutung des Kultes in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament (Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, Bd. 7) (Revision of the author's thesis: Heidelberg 1967). Göttingen 1971.
- (2418e) JEROME MURPHY-O'CONNOR: The Essenes and Their History. In: *Revue Biblique* 81, 1974, pp. 215–244.
- (2418f) JOSEPH M. BAUMGARTEN: *Studies in Qumran Law* (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 24, ed. JACOB NEUSNER). Leiden 1977.
- (2418g) JOHN NOLLAND: A Misleading Statement of the Essene Attitude to the Temple (Josephus, Antiquities, XVIII, I, 5, 19). In: *Revue de Qumran* 9, 1978, pp. 555–562.

It is difficult to accept the suggestion of BAUMGARTEN (2407) that the reference in Antiquities 18. 19 is to spiritualized sacrifices, since the phrase is never found elsewhere in this sense.

VAN DER PLOEG (2408) says that it is not to be supposed that the Essenes offered true sacrifices of their own as did the Jews of Elephantine or Leontopolis, since they were too pious for that. We may comment that, so far as this point is concerned, the Samaritans, who were certainly in their own way very pious, nevertheless on principle did offer their own sacrifices at Mount Gerizim.

WALLACE (2409) follows the manuscript reading of the Epitome and of the Latin version in inserting οὐκ in Antiquities 18. 19. He argues, though there is little evidence to support him, that the Essenes abandoned Temple sacrifices, perhaps because they preferred their rites to the Temple sacrifices; but our passage, we may note, speaks of the Essenes as being excluded and not as excluding themselves.

CROSS (2410) suggests that the meticulous burial of animal bones corroborates the statement of Josephus that the Qumran sect maintained an independent sacrificial cult, like that of the Temple of Onias. But such a view depends on equating the Essenes with the Qumran sect, with which it differs in several respects. Moreover, regardless of which reading one adopts in Antiquities 18. 19, the text reads that the Essenes did send votive offerings to the Temple.

SCHUBERT (2411), p. 55, interprets Antiquities 18. 19 to indicate that the Essenes engaged in worship separately, not that they sacrificed separately; but the plain meaning of the words θυσίαις ἐπιτελοῦσιν indicates that the issue is sacrifice, not worship.

STRUGNELL (2412), assuming the questionable identification of the Qumran sect with the Essenes, does not resolve the problem in Antiquities 18. 19 as to whether the Essenes sacrificed, though, as he notes, the Scrolls suggest that sacrifice was practiced.

ITURBE (2413), pp. 37–39, commenting on Antiquities 18. 19, accepts οὐκ.

BEEK (2414) says that sects such as the Essenes preserved the pure theocratic idea, with its equation of high priest and king, in hidden form.

SMITH (2415) says that the Essenes and the Dead Sea Sect (with whom he identifies them) were a schismatic Zadokite community which withdrew from participation in the cult of the Jerusalem temple rather than have contact with a non-Zadokite priesthood. He traces the origin of the Essenes to the rupture in the ranks of the Hasidim that resulted from the transference of the high priesthood from the Zadokite line to the Hasmoneans, since the Essene wing refused to accept the latter. This theory is supported, weakly we may add, by the fact that groups that are perhaps Pharisaic are vilified in the Dead Sea Scrolls. We have already commented on the fact that Josephus, at least, believed the origin of the sects to be much earlier (Ant. 18. 11).

RUCKSTUHL (2416), on the basis of Josephus' statement (Ant. 15. 372) that Herod was friendly toward the Essenes, explains the absence of the sect from Qumran during the reign of Herod by asserting that during this period the Essenes returned to Jerusalem. This theory, we may comment, rests on the assumption equating the Essenes and the Dead Sea Sect.

STECKOLL (2417) interprets Antiquities 18. 19 to mean not, as SCHUBERT (2411) would have it, that the Essenes engaged in worship separately but rather that they performed sacrifices away from the Jerusalem Temple. But such an interpretation goes counter to the manuscripts, which clearly state that the Essenes did send votive offerings to the Temple but performed their sacrifices employing a different ritual of purification.

BECKWITH (2418), assuming the equation of Qumran and the Essenes, says that the solar-lunar calendar in use at Qumran evidently forced the people there to postpone the offering of sacrifices until the priesthood in the Jerusalem Temple was ready to accept this calendar. We may comment that there is no evidence to support this, and we may recall that the Pharisees and Sadducees, who had different dates for the festival of Pentecost, continued to offer sacrifices in the Temple.

BICKERMAN (2418a), p. 143, asserts that where Josephus speaks of the sacrifices of the Essenes that were offered outside the Temple (Ant. 18. 19), this cannot be understood as referring to their lustrations.

BLACK (2418b) stresses the Latin version of Antiquities 18. 19: *sacrificia vel hostias cum populo non celebrant*, and concludes that Essenes did sacrifice in the Temple but did not use the common precinct because of their more rigorous standard of purity.

BIHLER (2418c), pp. 142–143, commenting on Antiquities 18. 19, asserts that Josephus is not speaking of fundamental abstention from sacrifices but rather of non-participation by the Essenes in Temple services.

KLINZING (2418d), pp. 44–49, asserts that the negative in the Epitome and in the Latin version is the genuine reading in Antiquities 18. 19, and contends that the context is clearer with it than without it. He remarks on the difficulty in interpreting θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσιν (Ant. 18. 19) figuratively in the same context where it is understood literally to refer to the fact that the Essenes do or do not offer sacrifices. He reconciles the divine service as a cultic meal in Ant. 18. 19 with Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit, 86 and 91, by asserting that the Essenes did

not sacrifice in the Temple and kept far from there because of fundamental problems of purity.

MURPHY-O'CONNOR (2418e) assuming the identity of the Essenes and the Dead Sea Sect, remarks that Antiquities 18. 19 is in accord with the Damascus Document 5. 6b. 7, which says that the sect opposed participation in sacrifices.

BAUMGARTEN (2418f), noting that there is no mention of a sanctuary at Qumran in the Dead Sea Scrolls, concludes that since, according to Antiquities 18. 19, the Essenes did sacrifice somewhere, the only alternative is that the Temple to which their offerings were sent was also the place of the sacrifices of the Essenes. What prevented the Essenes from using the common precincts for the completion of the sacrifices was their own more rigorous standard of purity. Hence there was some form of segregation within the Temple. BAUMGARTEN argues convincingly that if the Essenes had sacrificed at Qumran, Josephus, a priest, would have been sharply critical of them.

NOLLAND (2418g), commenting on Antiquities 18. 19, says that Josephus knew or assumed that the Essenes paid the Temple tax, since all Jews did so. Furthermore, payments of the Temple-tax are called ἀναθήματα (cf. Ant. 18. 312); and so Josephus could honestly, but deceptively, say that the Essenes sent ἀναθήματα to the Temple, implying that the Essenes would gladly have sacrificed in the Temple but that the authorities would not let them sacrifice using the ritual purification rites that they thought necessary. Reading οὐκ ἐπιτελοῦσι, he attempts systematically to refute STRUGNELL (2412). Josephus thus gave a deliberately misleading portrayal of the Essenes, indicating that instead of separating themselves they were expelled by the Temple authorities. We may comment that in view of the fact that the 'Antiquities' was published less than a generation after the disappearance of the Essenes, it seems unlikely that Josephus, who was constantly subject to carping criticism, would have dared to present such a misleading depiction of the Essenes, since there were surely many still alive who remembered the truth about the Essene attitude toward the sacrifices.

## 22.20: Ritual and Practices of the Essenes: Initiation, Baths, Purity, Asceticism, Prayer, Work

- (2419) ROLAND DE VAUX: Une hachette essénienne? In: *Vetus Testamentum* 9, 1959, pp. 399–407.
- (2420) KRISTER STENDAHL: *Axios* im Lichte der Texte der Qumran-Höhle. In: *Nuntius Sodalicii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis* 7, 1952, pp. 53–55.
- (2421) OTTO BETZ: Le Ministère cultuel dans la Secte de Qumrân et dans le Christianisme primitif. In: JOHANNES P. M. VAN DER PLOEG, ed., *La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme* (Recherches Bibliques, 4). Brussels and Paris 1959. Pp. 163–202.
- (2422) JOACHIM GNILKA: Die essenischen Tauchbäder und die Johannestaufe. In: *Revue de Qumran* 3, 1961–62, pp. 185–207.
- (2423) FRANCISZEK JÓZWIAK: The Ritual Ablutions in Qumran and the Baptism of John (in Polish). In: *Ateneum Kaplânskie* 68, 1965, pp. 137–151.
- (2424) GEORGE W. BUCHANAN: The Role of Purity in the Structure of the Essene Sect. In: *Revue de Qumran* 4, 1963–64, pp. 397–406.

- (2425) JOSEPH M. BAUMGARTEN: The Essene Avoidance of Oil and the Laws of Purity. In: *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1967, pp. 183–192.
- (2426) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Esséniens et Eunuques (Matthieu 19. 10–12). In: *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1968, pp. 353–390.
- (2427) A. STEINER: Warum lebten die Essener asketisch? In: *Biblische Zeitschrift* 15, 1971, pp. 1–28.
- (2428) FRANK M. CROSS: The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. Garden City, New York 1958; rev. ed. 1961.
- (2429) SHMARJAHU TALMON: A Further Link between the Judean Covenanters and the Essenes. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 56, 1963, pp. 313–319.
- (2429a) THOMAS FRANCIS GLASSON: Greek Influence in Jewish Eschatology. With Special Reference to the Apocalypses and Pseudepigraphs. London 1961.
- (2429b) GEORGE R. BEASLEY-MURRAY: Baptism in the New Testament. London 1962. Trans. into German: Die christliche Taufe. Eine Untersuchung über ihr Verständnis in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Kassel 1968.
- (2429c) ROBERT NORTH: The Qumran Reservoirs. In: JOHN L. MCKENZIE, ed., *The Bible in Current Catholic Thought* (St. Mary's Theology Studies, 1). New York 1962. Pp. 100–132.
- (2429d) MATTHIAS DELCOR: Recherches sur un horoscope en langue hébraïque provenant de Qumrân. In: *Revue de Qumran* 5, 1964–66, pp. 521–542.
- (2429e) SAMUEL IWRY: A New Designation for the Luminaries in Ben Sira and in the Manual of Discipline (1 QS). In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 200, 1970, pp. 41–47.
- (2429f) MATTHEW BLACK: The Tradition of Hasidæan-Essene Asceticism: Its Origins and Influence. In: *Aspects du Judéo-Christianisme. Colloque de Strasbourg 23–25 Avril 1964*. Paris 1965. Pp. 19–32.
- (2429g) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: Culpabilité et rites de purification dans la secte juive de Qoumrân. In: *Semitica* 15, 1965, pp. 61–70.
- (2429h) ABEL ISAKSSON: Marriage and Ministry in the New Temple. A Study with Special Reference to Mt. 19, 13 [i.e. 3]–12 and i Cor. 11, 3–16 (Orig. diss., Uppsala 1965; trans. by NEIL TOMKINSON and JEAN GRAY; *Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, 24). Lund 1965.
- (2429i) PIERRE BENOIT: Qumran and the New Testament. In: JEROME MURPHY-O'CONNOR, ed., *Paul and Qumran. Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Chicago 1968. Pp. 1–30.
- (2429j) BERNHARD LOHSE: Askese und Mönchtum in der Antike und in der alten Kirche (Religion und Kultur der alten Mittelmeerwelt in Parallelforschungen, Bd. 1). München 1969.
- (2429k) ALFRED MARX: Les racines du célibat essénien. In: *Revue de Qumran* 7, 1969–71, pp. 323–342.
- (2429l) HANS HÜBNER: Zölibat in Qumran? In: *New Testament Studies* 17, 1970–71, pp. 153–167.
- (2429m) JEROME MURPHY-O'CONNOR: The Essenes and Their History. In: *Revue Biblique* 81, 1974, pp. 215–244.
- (2429n) GERALD J. BLIDSTEIN: 4 Q Florilegium and Rabbinic Sources on Bastard and Proselyte. In: *Revue de Qumran* 8, 1972–74, pp. 431–435.
- (2429o) GEZA VERMES: The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective. London 1977; Cleveland 1978.
- (2429p) ROY A. ROSENBERG: Who Is the More haššedeq? In: *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 36, 1968, pp. 118–122.
- (2429q) ANTOINE GUILLAUMONT: A propos du célibat des Esséniens. In: *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*. Paris 1971. Pp. 395–404.
- (2429r) ABTAI MARIA FRIEDEN: Die Jungfräulichkeit in der Heiligen Schrift. In: *Erbe und Auftrag* 54, 1978, pp. 134–144, 217–225.

Josephus (War 2. 137) says that the Essenes at the beginning of their novitiate receive a small hatchet. When a small hatchet was found in Grotto 11 of Qumran, there were immediate cries that the identification had been proved; but DE VAUX (2419), in a sober article, concludes that it is impossible to demonstrate that the hatchet is or is not an Essene tool.

STENDAHL (2420) comments on the requirement (War 2. 138) that initiates must be found worthy (ἄξιτοι). He notes that the same word (ἀξιτου) is found (War 2. 134) in connection with the deserving people whom members of the order may on their own initiative help.

BETZ (2421) asserts that the Essene baths have elements of a sacrifice and interprets Antiquities 18. 19 to indicate that the Essene purifications are substitutes for sacrifices in the Temple. But, we may recall, this passage states that the Essenes do send votive offerings to the Temple; and, we may remark, while War 2, 129–130 indicates that the baths are necessary for purity, there is no indication of any connection with a sacrifice.

Noting the priestly descent of John the Baptist, GNILKA (2422) emphasizes the similarity between the baptism of John and the purificatory rites of the Jewish priests and pilgrims prior to participation in the Temple service.

I have not seen JÓZWIĄK (2423).

BUCHANAN (2424) traces back to the purity rules of the Bible three Essene practices described by Josephus — their communistic economy, their monasticism, and their refusal to acquire slaves. We may comment that there is no indication in the Bible of opposition to slavery, though there are, of course, provisions to ameliorate the lot of slaves. BUCHANAN says that Josephus' explanation (Ant. 18. 21) of the reason for their avoidance of slaves is that slaves will give occasion to the formation of factions, and he prefers this to Philo's, which is that the Essenes have a conviction that all men are equal. BUCHANAN, we may comment, has here misread Josephus, who says that the Essenes avoid wives and slaves, the latter because they contribute to injustice (ἀδικίαν) and the former because they lead to dissension (στάσεως, "factionalism"). By injustice Josephus means inequality, as we see from what follows, that the Essenes, instead of having slaves, perform menial tasks for one another.

BAUMGARTEN (2425) says that War 2. 123, which states that the Essenes consider oil to be defiling, supports the Damascus Document 12. 15–17; but, we may comment, the latter refers to contagious impurity, whereas the Essenes regarded oil in itself as defiling, regardless of whether the person touching it is clean or unclean, presumably because they, in their asceticism, regarded oil as a symbol of luxury.

BETZ (2421) comments on the conflicting evidence of Josephus with regard to the celibacy of the Essenes. According to War 2. 120–121, they disdain marriage for themselves, though they do not in principle condemn wedlock for others; and this position is supported by Antiquities 18. 21, which states that they do not bring wives into the community. In War 2. 160–161, however, he speaks of "another order of Essenes" who did marry. The implication, as BETZ properly notes, is that the main order of the Essenes did not.



DANIEL (2426) cites *Antiquities* 18. 21, where Josephus says that the Essenes do not marry because marriage leads to discord, in support of his view that the reference in Matthew 19. 10–12 to the eunuchs who have been made eunuchs by men refers to the Essenes. The connection, it is superfluous to say, is very tenuous: the Talmud, for example, speaks of Ben Azzai, who did not marry “for human reasons” (so that he might concentrate on his studies), and no one has yet suggested that he was an Essene.

STEINER (2427) argues that the motivation of the Essenes’ asceticism is not rational but theological, as their obedience to the Torah shows. Thus, since their thought is not anthropocentric but theocentric, one cannot really call their way of life ascetic, since they did not aim to bring the body under the domination of the spirit but rather followed the instructions of priests in preparing for a holy war.

CROSS (2428), commenting on War 2. 128, which speaks of the Essenes’ prayers to the sun, says that the meaning is that they prayed toward the sun, that is, rather than toward the Temple, since (*Ant.* 18. 19) they disagreed with the way sacrifices were offered there. The use of the prepositional phrase, εἰς αὐτόν, rather than the dative αὐτῷ, we may comment, confirms CROSS’ suggestion, though Josephus adds that they pray as if they beseech the sun to rise; and in this they may be reverting to the practice in the days of the First Temple, as noted in the Talmud, *Sukkah* 51 b.

TALMON (2429) finds a parallel between War 2. 129, with its statement that the Essenes cease work before their assembly at the fifth hour, and the Damascus Document 11. 22 b–12. 1 a, and consequently argues that this supports the equation of the Dead Sea Sect and the Essenes. But, we may comment, there is no mention in Josephus of sounding trumpets or the importance of doing so at precisely the right time or the importance of ceasing from work, nor is there mention in the ‘Damascus Document’ that it is at the beginning of the fifth hour that the assembly is to take place.

GLASSON (2429a), pp. 48–56, comments on Josephus’ description of the Essenes, especially on War 2. 154–155. As to Josephus’ statement that the Essenes looked upon the body as a prison-house, it is possible that Josephus is here merely appealing to Gentile readers, but it would be difficult to suppose that he would think of a ‘fixed conviction’ if he were attributing to the Essenes a belief which he knew they did not hold. As to the eschatological passage in Hippolytus (*Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* 9. 22), which appears to be related to Josephus and which seems to be connected with Greek views, it is uncertain whether Josephus is here to be trusted.

BEASLEY-MURRAY (2429b), pp. 12–17, comments on baptism among the Essenes at Qumran. He notes that whereas Essenes took baths at least three times a day, baptism in the New Testament is a rite that is administered only once. He suggests (p. 17) that by the time of Josephus certain lustrations that were practiced among the Essenes had a special sacramental significance.

NORTH (2429c), pp. 105–106, quotes, in English translation, a passage in Josephus (War 2. 123ff.) referring to purification rites of the Essenes. These requirements, he suggests, are reflected in the noticeable multiplicity and

structure of the Qumran reservoirs. No non-cultic explanations of the reservoirs, including that of storage or private baths exclusively, is fully satisfactory.

DELCOR (2429d) insists that the discovery of a horoscope in Hebrew confirms the identification of the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes, who (Ant. 13. 172) believed in Destiny as the master in all things. This explains why the Essenes supplicated the sun (War 2. 128 and 148), which plays a major role in the casting of horoscopes. We may reply that the worship of the sun merely indicates that the Essenes prayed in the direction of the sun, that is, to the East.

IWRY (2429e) contends that since the Essenes prayed facing the sun as if invoking it to rise, it follows that the sun was determinative in fixing the holidays. This, we may reply, is hardly the meaning, which is that the sect faced eastward toward the rising sun while praying. He remarks that the Dead Sea Scrolls include many passages referring to the sun and to the luminaries.

BLACK (2429f) contends that the Qumran library explains the origin of the sexual asceticism of the Essenes. It does not derive from the warrior's obligation to abstain from sexual intercourse, since, according to Josephus, the celibacy was for life; but BLACK suggests that Josephus' account may be an exaggerated one.

DUPONT-SOMMER (2429g) presents a survey of the rules of purity in Josephus and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. He sees no distinction between the Essenes and the Qumran sect in this matter. We may, however, object that the two groups had, in fact, diametrically opposed conceptions of purity and purification, since the Essenes believed that they alone were pure.

ISAKSSON (2429h), pp. 45–57, contrasts the portrait of the Essenes in Josephus with the Qumran sect, noting that the Dead Sea Manual of Discipline says nothing about a prospective member of the community having to live a celibate life. He thus disagrees with the view that the Sect, like the Essenes, had two wings, one of which married. He notes that the reasons given in Josephus for the Essenes' attitude toward women are not found in the writings of the Sect. Josephus' statement that the Essenes refrained from sexual relations with pregnant wives, he says, is correct, but not for the reason given by Josephus. The real reason was that a person had to avoid defiling himself by emission of semen that was unnecessary for begetting children.

BENOIT (2429i) presents a critical interpretation of Josephus' reports on the hermit Bannus (Life 11), John the Baptist (Ant. 18. 117), and the Essenes (War 2. 137, 259–261). He notes that Bannus lived in the desert on a sparse diet, wore special dress, and emphasized ablutions, all of which make him resemble John the Baptist; and yet, no one claims him as an Essene.

LOHSE (2429j), pp. 89–95, uncritically discusses the description of the Essenes in Josephus. He identifies the Essenes with the Dead Sea Sect and contends that at Qumran the Essenes lived in celibacy, arguing that the bones of the women found at Qumran do not prove that they belonged to the community.

MARX (2429k) comments on the evidence of Josephus (War 2. 160–161 and Ant. 18. 21) as to two types of Essenes and the reasons for celibacy. He argues that Josephus is here in accord with Philo.

HÜBNER (2429l), citing War 2. 160, denies that the sectarians at Qumran were celibate.

MURPHY-O'CONNOR (2429m) asks why Josephus notes that the Essenes were Jews by birth, since nothing similar is said of the Pharisees and the Sadducees, and concludes that this must be because there was some doubt about this. He contends that only a hypothesis of Babylonian origin can explain their interest in plants and stones, divination, astrology, lustrations (which he asserts are hygienically necessary in Babylonia), and prayer to the East. We may respond by noting that such interests and practices are shown by the Talmudic rabbis also. We may also remark, as BLIDSTEIN (2429n) has shown, that the Dead Sea Sect, which MURPHY-O'CONNOR identifies with the Essenes, were opposed to proselytism, and this would seem hardly a defensible position for them to take if they themselves were proselytes.

VERMES (2429o), pp. 163–197, discusses the religious ideas and ideals of the Dead Sea Community, co-ordinating them with Josephus. He concludes that despite the attempt that he and others have made to attribute the sect's celibacy to misogyny, a more reasonable explanation is that it was thought that lives intended to be wholly consecrated to worship and prophecy should be kept completely pure.

ROSENBERG (2429p) explains Josephus' statement (War 2. 128) that the Essenes pray to the sun by noting that it is logical that they should think of Elijah, who ascended to heaven in the chariot of the sun, as returning to earth in the guise of the Zedek, G-d's justice manifested in the sun. This, we may comment, is mere conjecture; Josephus implies nothing of the sort in his long account of the Essenes. Their praying to the sun is merely, we may again add, another way of saying that they pray in the direction in which the sun rises, the East.

GUILLAUMONT (2429q) remarks that Josephus (War 2. 120–121, Ant. 18. 21) is repeating a commonplace found in Cynic and Stoic diatribes, on the disadvantages of marriage according to the Essenes.

FRIEDEN (2429r) discusses the practice of celibacy among the Essenes.

## 22.21: The Meals of the Essenes

(2430) KARL G. KUHN: The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran. In: KRISTER STENDAHL, ed., *The Scrolls and the New Testament*. New York 1957. Pp. 65–93.

(2431) JOHANNES VAN DER PLOEG: The Meals of the Essenes. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2, 1957, pp. 163–175.

(2432) JOHANNES VAN DER PLOEG: *Vondsten in de Woestijn van Juda*. Utrecht 1957. Trans. into English by KEVIN SMYTH: *The Excavations at Qumran: A Survey of the Judean Brotherhood and Its Ideas*. London 1958.

- (2433) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. New York 1953–68.
- (2434) MORTON SMITH: G-d's Begetting the Messiah in 1QSa. In: *New Testament Studies* 5, 1958–59, pp. 218–224.
- (2435) OTTO BETZ: Le Ministère cultuel dans la Secte de Qumrân et dans le Christianisme primitif. In: JOHANNES P. M. VAN DER PLOEG, ed., *La Secte de Qumrân et les Origines du Christianisme* (Recherches Bibliques, 4). Brussels and Paris 1959. Pp. 163–202.
- (2436) EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE: Sacred Meals at Qumran? In: *Heythrop Journal* 1, 1960, pp. 48–65.
- (2437) JOACHIM GNILKA: Das Gemeinschaftsmahl der Essener. In: *Biblische Zeitschrift* 5, 1961, pp. 39–55.
- (2438) MATTHIAS DELCOR: Repas culturels esséniens et thérapeutes. Thiases et ḥaburoth. In: *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1967–69, pp. 401–425.
- (2438a) WILFRIED PASCHEN: Rein und unrein. Untersuchung zur biblischen Wortgeschichte. München 1970.

KUHN (2430), pp. 66–70, comparing Josephus' account (War 2. 129–131) of the Essene meals with the account in the 'Manual of Discipline', says that it is one of the most significant points of agreement between Josephus and the Manual, that it is a priest who gives the blessing before and after the meal. He concludes that the meal was a cultic meal. We may comment that it is not just among the Essenes or the Dead Sea Sect that the priest has this privilege; see, for example, the definitive code of Jewish law, Joseph Karo's *Shulḥan Arukh*, *Orah Ḥayyim* 201. 2.

VAN DER PLOEG (2431) (2432) argues that KUHN is wrong in imputing a sacral character to the Essenes' meals and argues that Josephus speaks only of a communal meal. He remarks, furthermore, that Josephus speaks only of bread and not of wine. We may note that Josephus (War 2. 129) says that the Essenes go to their refectory "as to some sacred shrine", thus indicating that it is only similar to but not identical with a sacred meal. In fact, not only the Essenes but all Jews regard the table from which they eat as a miniature altar; but only in this symbolic sense is the meal sacred. We may recall that in connection with the decree of Julius Caesar permitting the Jews of Delos to hold their accustomed meals, GOODENOUGH (2433), vol. 6, p. 206, had argued that these meals had a mystic significance, but there, too, the evidence is lacking.

SMITH (2434) concludes that the meal in the Manual is not sacred and that the text should be restored differently.

BETZ (2435) says that the discovery at Qumran of hundreds of plates stacked neatly in piles of a dozen confirms the identification of the Sect with the Essenes, since Josephus (War 2. 130) says that the cook set before each Essene one plate with a single course. We may reply that it is a fair assumption that other groups ate from plates as well and may have been neat about them.

SUTCLIFFE (2436) concludes that there is no evidence that the Essenes' meals had a sacred cultic character. He says that Josephus is not correct in stating (War 2. 129) that novices were not permitted to touch the food of the community, since he himself elsewhere (Ant. 18. 22) says that the preparation of food was entrusted only to priests; hence not only novices but also non-priests

were excluded. We may comment that Josephus in the 'War' is not talking about the preparation of the food but about who may enter the refectory.

GNILKA (2437) concludes that the Essenes' meal was a holy meal, but, in contrast with the Christian eucharistic meal, that it was not directed toward a Messiah. He imputes importance to the fact that the meal was under priestly auspices. Since Josephus speaks of the meal in connection with other pious practices and cult actions, he imputes similar significance to the meal itself and hence opposes VAN DER PLOEG. But, we may comment, Josephus is merely giving the events of a typical day: the fact that he mentions their handicrafts (War 2. 129) in immediate juxtaposition with their ablutions (*ibid.*) does not impute special significance to the former.

DELCOR (2438) similarly disagrees with VAN DER PLOEG and argues that a comparison of the Essenes' communal meals with Greco-Roman  $\theta\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\sigma\iota$  and Jewish *haburoth* shows the originality of the Essene meals. He concludes that the meals were sacred from the fact that they were preceded by ritual baths, were eaten by the Essenes dressed in sacred vestments in a dining room regarded by Josephus as a sanctuary, were accompanied by the drinking of wine, and were prepared by priests, and from the fact (Ant. 18. 19) that the Essenes apparently offered sacrifices not in Jerusalem but in their own domain. As noted above, the concept of a meal as 'sacred' in the sense that the table is a miniature altar is an analogy found not only among the Essenes but also among all other Jews. As to Antiquities 18. 19, there is no evidence in Josephus, regardless of which reading is adopted, that the Essenes offered sacrifices at a place other than Jerusalem.

PASCHEN (2438a), pp. 109–114, concludes that Josephus' remarks on the Essenes' communism of goods and meals are indications of a ritual and social restraint of purity which stand close to the Dead Sea Sect.

## 22.22: The Oaths of the Essenes

- (2439) OTTO MICHEL: Der Schwur der Essener. In: Theologische Literaturzeitung 81, 1956, pp. 189–190.
- (2440) ERNST KUTSCH: Der Eid der Essener, ein Beitrag zu dem Problem des Textes von Josephus Bell. Jud. 2, 8, 7 (§ 142). In: Theologische Literaturzeitung 81, 1956, pp. 495–498.
- (2441) E. GROSS: Noch einmal: Der Essenereid bei Josephus. In: Theologische Literaturzeitung 82, 1957, pp. 73–74.
- (2442) ROLAND BERGMEIER: Loyalität als Gegenstand paulinischer Paraklese. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm 13, 1ff. and Jos. B. J. 2, 140. In: Theokratia 1, 1967–69, pp. 51–63.
- (2443) ISTVÁN HAHN: Zwei dunkle Stellen in Josephus (Bellum Judaicum VI, § 311 und II, § 142). In: Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae 14, 1962, pp. 131–138.
- (2444) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Les Esséniens et l'arrière-fond historique de la parabole du Bon Samaritain. In: Novum Testamentum 11, 1969, pp. 71–104.

- (2445) JOSEPH D. AMOUSSINE: *Observatiunculae Qumranae*. II: 'Ἀφέξεσθαι δὲ ληστείας dans le 'De Bello Judaico' (II, viii, 7, 142). In: *Revue de Qumran* 7, 1971, pp. 535–545.
- (2445a) MARTIN DIBELIUS: *Rom und die Christen im ersten Jahrhundert* (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Jahrg. 1941/42, 2. Abhandlung). Heidelberg 1942.
- (2445b) MORTON SMITH: *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*. Cambridge, Mass. 1973.

In a commentary on War 2. 139–142, MICHEL (2439) concludes that the Dead Sea Sectaries are the Essenes.

KUTSCH (2440), assuming the questionable identification of the Sectaries with the Essenes, then unconvincingly proceeds to correct Josephus, whose statement that the Essenes swore to abstain from robbery represents, he says, Josephus' misinterpretation of the Scrolls.

GROSS (2441) rightly remarks that Josephus was too well versed in the ways of the Essenes to have made the mistake ascribed to him by KUTSCH.

BERGMEIER (2442), discussing the Essenes' oath (War 2. 140) to obey the powers that be, since, as they believe, no ruler attains his office except by divine will, notes the parallel with the New Testament (Romans 13. 1ff.) both in the form of the brief statement and in the theological context stressing the duty of obeying. The difference is merely that in Romans the obedience is to political rule, whereas in Josephus it is to the elder of the Essene order. We may comment that for the idea of obedience to the political rulers one need not go to the Essenes: one finds similar views throughout Pharisaic literature (e.g. Avoth 3. 2). Moreover, the reference in Josephus speaks of keeping faith with all men, especially with the powers that be (τοῖς κρατοῦσιν), there being no indication that this is restricted only to the elders of the Essene order.

HAHN (2443) explains that the oath of the Essenes (War 2. 142) to abstain from brigandage (ἀφέξεσθαι . . . ληστείας) refers to the interdiction of revolting against Rome and of leading an organized war against it and argues that near the end of their history the Essenes actually moved close in ideology to the Zealots, though they still avoided the individual terrorist methods of the Sicarii. We may comment that there is no indication that ληστεία means anything but robbery; it has nothing to do with the Zealots but rather with the robbery that, as we see from the pages of Josephus, the New Testament, and the Talmud, was so common in the land of Israel at this time. If there had been a rapprochement with the Zealots, Josephus should have used a political term for revolt.

DANIEL (2444) also equates the λησταί with the Zealots and notes that since even Herod showed favoritism toward the Essenes, the greatest enemies of the Zealots, the Essenes must, indeed, have been the greatest enemies of the Zealots; we may remark that Josephus (War 2. 142) says only that the Essenes swore to abstain from robbery (ληστείας) generally; he does not say that they swore to keep away from the robbers (τῶν ληστῶν, who might perhaps, if this phrase had been used, be equated with the Zealots).

AMOUSSINE (2445) says that the expression ἀφέξεσθαι δὲ ληστείας (War 2. 142) does not fit into the context; and he objects to HAHN's interpretation. He

suggests that *ληστεία* is a translation of Hebrew *hamas* and notes that in the Dead Sea Scrolls *hamas* is violence, literal or figurative, in the sense of altercation or incorrect interpretation, which follows well the preceding injunction to transmit the rules of the order exactly. AMOUSSINE's approach is ingenious, except that Josephus had assistants in the composition of the War Against Apion 1. 50) who generally caught such things.

DIBELIUS (2445a), p. 8, briefly discusses the oath of the Essenes (War 2. 140).

SMITH (2445b), p. 53, comments on swearing among the Essenes (War 2. 135, 139–143), as compared with the early Christians. He also comments (p. 198) on the Essenes' practice of secrecy (War 2. 119ff., Ant. 18. 11ff.).

## 22.23: The Pacifism of the Essenes

(2446) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: The Hidden Scrolls and the War of the Jews against the Romans (in Hebrew). In: Davar Jahrbuch, edd. D. ZACCAI and ZALMAN SHAZAR. Tel-Aviv 1954. Pp. 286–295.

(2447) MARCEL SIMON: Les sectes Juives au temps de Jésus. Paris 1960. Trans. into German by EGON WILHELM and BRUNO STORNI: Die jüdischen Sekten zur Zeit Christi. Einsiedeln 1964. Trans. into English by JAMES H. FARLEY: Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus. Philadelphia 1967.

(2448) ATHANASE NÉGOÏT(s)A: Les Esséniens après la destruction du deuxième Temple. In: Studia et Acta Orientalia 7, 1968, pp. 23–33.

(2449) ATHANASE NÉGOÏT(s)A: Did the Essenes Survive the 66–71 [sic] War? In: Revue de Qumran 6, 1969, pp. 517–530.

(2449a) FERDINAND HAHN: Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum (Based on diss., Heidelberg: Anfänge christologischer Traditionen). Göttingen 1963. Trans. into English by HAROLD KNIGHT and GEORGE OGG: The Titles of Jesus in Christology; their history in early Christianity. London 1969.

(2449b) YIGAL YADIN: Militante Herodianer aus Qumran. Die Essener zwingen Christen und Juden zum Umdenken. In: Lutherische Monatshefte 18, 1979, pp. 355–358.

KLAUSNER (2446), citing Antiquities 18. 18–19, states that the Essenes were complete pacifists who were opposed even to the sacrifices of animals and birds because they involve the shedding of blood, and then notes an apparent contradiction in that they were courageous in the war against the Romans and that one of them, John the Essene, even became a general. He then triumphantly asserts that Qumran has solved this problem, concluding that a portion of the Essenes became activists and that Simon bar Giora became a friend of the group, just as a portion of the Zealots became Pharisees. We may comment that Antiquities 18. 18–19 has nothing to do with pacifism, since Josephus says that they do send votive offerings to the Temple. The only indication in Josephus that they are opposed to the shedding of blood is to be found in the statement (War 2. 142) that they take an oath to abstain from robbery; but there is no indication that they would not fight in self-defense. The statement (War 2. 152) that in the war with the Romans they were forced to submit to every type of torture does not show that they did not fight originally; and, in fact, one may guess that the reason why the Romans tortured them so cruelly, in view of the

general Roman policy of *laissez faire*, was that they saw them participating in the revolt or suspected them of doing so. Philo, to be sure (*Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit* 78), says that they do not manufacture weapons; but he then goes on to say that they do not manufacture any peaceful implements either, since they do not have vaguest idea of commerce, which, they think, leads to vice. Here, too, there is no evidence that they would not possess weapons for their own use in self-defense in contrast to manufacturing them for sale. We may comment that similarly Jesus' pacifism did not extend to his enemies, as we see in such statements as Matthew 10. 34: "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace but a sword" and Luke 19.27: "But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring them and slay them before me."

SIMON (2447), identifying the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes, says that the accounts of Josephus and Philo concerning the pacifism of the Essenes need to be revised; but this is based on the unproven premise that the Sect is the Essene group and that the Essenes were indeed pacifists.

NEGOÏT(s)A (2448) (2449) cannot resolve the contradiction that the Essenes, who, he says, were opposed to war, produced a general, John the Essene (*War* 2. 567, 3. 11), in the revolt against Rome and suggests that perhaps John is so called because he had been an Essene before he had become a commander, just as Simon the Zealot (*Luke* 6. 15, *Acts* 1. 13) is so called because he had been a Zealot before becoming an apostle of Jesus, or perhaps that isolated Essenes or even a faction of them, but not the whole order, participated in the war. We may suggest that perhaps John participated as a general just as Josephus participated, that is, half-heartedly, since it is, indeed, hard to believe that the Essenes opposed the Romans, in view of the praise which Josephus bestows upon them. NEGOÏT(s)A interprets the Essene oath to abstain from robbery (*ληστείας*, *War* 2. 142) to imply that they vowed not to associate with the Zealots, but there is no evidence to support such a broad equation of *λησται* and Zealots.

HAHN (2449a), p. 170, comments on the carrying of weapons by Essenes as a protection against brigands (*War* 2. 125).

YADIN (2449b) concludes that the Essenes were "militant pacifists" who would readily join in military action against the "sons of darkness".

## 22.24: The History of the Essenes

- (2450) CHARLES T. FRITSCH: Herod the Great and the Qumran Community. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74, 1955, pp. 173–181.
- (2451) RALPH MARCUS: The Qumran Scrolls and Early Judaism. In: *Biblical Research* 1, 1956, pp. 9–47.
- (2452) JAMES KELSO: The Archaeology of Qumran. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74, 1955, pp. 141–147.
- (2453) JOHN M. ALLEGRO: The Dead Sea Scrolls. Harmondsworth 1956, 1958, 1959.
- (2454) KARL H. RENGSTORF: *Hirbet Qumrân und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer*. Stuttgart 1960. Trans. into English (abridged) by J. R. WILKIE: *Hirbet Qumran and the Problem of the Library of the Dead Sea Caves*. Leiden 1963.



- (2455) ATHANASE NÉGOÏT(s)A: Les Esséniens après la destruction du deuxième Temple. In: *Studia et Acta Orientalia* 7, 1968, pp. 23–33.
- (2456) ATHANASE NÉGOÏT(s)A: Did the Essenes Survive the 66–71 [sic] War? In: *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1969, pp. 517–530.
- (2456a) JEROME MURPHY-O'CONNOR: The Essenes in Palestine. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 40, 1977, pp. 100–124. Trans. into Italian: *Gli Esseni in Palestina*. In: *Ricerche Bibliche Religiose* 14, 1979, pp. 251–285.
- (2456b) S. GORANSON: On the Hypothesis that Essenes Lived on Mt. Carmel. In: *Revue de Qumran* 9, 1978, pp. 563–567.

FRITSCH (2450) notes that archaeological evidence at Qumran indicates that it was not until the end of the second century B.C.E. that the community, which he identifies with the Essenes, moved out into the desert near the Dead Sea. The self-imposed exile, he adds, took place at the very time that John Hyrcanus broke with the Pharisees (*Ant.* 13. 288–298), and this seems more than coincidental. FRITSCH then suggests that the sect's migration from Qumran was due to their enmity for Herod, who had a palace in nearby Jericho and who must have been irked by their military character. We may comment that archaeology, despite great advances, is far from being so exact a science as to be able to date, merely from remains, any event so precisely as FRITSCH would claim. As to the sect's enmity for Herod, even FRITSCH admits that Josephus (*Ant.* 15. 378) declares that they were held in honor by Herod. He tries to explain away the latter statement by suggesting that Josephus may not have been describing this group of Essenes or that Josephus was trying to portray Herod in a favorable light wherever possible. We may note, however, that in *Antiquities* 15. 378, Josephus says specifically that from the time when the Essene Manaemus (Menahem) predicted that Herod had twenty or even thirty years more to reign, Herod continued to hold all Essenes in honor. As for Josephus' attempt to portray Herod in a favorable light, a glance at Manaemus' prediction (*Ant.* 15. 376), clearly accepted as true, that Herod would forget piety and justice, as well as at many other features in Josephus' portrait, shows the very opposite. We may add that Herod may indeed have resented the Dead Sea Sect, if we say that the sect were not Essenes, because of its extreme Messianic apocalyptic teachings, since he himself apparently, as noted above, had Messianic delusions.

MARCUS (2451) tries to date the chief events of the sect's history in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus on the ground that we know more about the effects of the internal and external political situation on the religious parties in Judea in his reign than in any other quarter-century during the period. We may comment, however, that this is conjectural, since Josephus, who chooses to give us a fair amount about Jannaeus' attitude toward and treatment of the Pharisees and Sadducees tells us nothing about his treatment of the Essenes.

KELSO (2452) notes archaeological evidence of an earthquake at Qumran near the site of the Sect's settlement, and he and ALLEGRO (2453) theorize that the earthquake of 31 B.C.E. in Judea described by Josephus (*Ant.* 15. 121–122) is what brought the first occupational period of the sect at Qumran to an end. In view of the fact that, according to Josephus, 30,000 people perished

in this earthquake, such a guess seems quite possible. When, however, ALLEGRO cites Josephus (War 4. 486) to support his statement that a panic that ensued when Vespasian came to Jericho (just after, we may note, he had visited the Dead Sea, War 4. 477) is what brought an end to the Dead Sea sect, he goes too far, since Josephus gives no indication that Vespasian, who was intrigued by the peculiar properties of the Dead Sea, was aware of this strange sect or that his visit caused any panic to them or to anyone else in the area.

RENGSTORF (2454) properly argues against the theory that the Essene monasteries were destroyed in 68 as strong points of the revolutionaries, on the ground that Josephus says nothing about this.

NEGOÏT(S)A (2455) (2456) argues that the Essenes did not disappear after the war with the Romans, since neither Josephus nor Pliny speaks of their disappearance, and since the fourth-century Epiphanius (Panarion, Heresy 19, and *Adversus Haereses* 1. 20) speaks of the Essenes as though still existing. He suggests that the Karaites, who arose in the eighth century, are a continuation of them. We may comment that Josephus and Pliny speak of the Essenes in the present tense as a device to make them more vivid. Moreover, since Epiphanius identifies some of the Samaritans as Essenes, we cannot take his evidence too seriously. Finally, we may comment that Epiphanius speaks not of the Essenes but of the Ossenes, who may not be identical. Inasmuch as neither the Karaites nor their bitter opponents, the Rabbanites, assert that they are a continuation of the Essenes, NEGOÏT(S)A's suggestion that they are is far-fetched.

MURPHY-O'CONNOR (2456a) postulates that the Essenes represented the ultra-conservative branch of Babylonian Jewry, that when they returned to Palestine after Judah the Maccabee's victories in 165 B.C.E., they opposed the Hellenized Judaism and supported the Zadokite high priest (whom MURPHY-O'CONNOR identifies with the Teacher of Righteousness) against Jonathan (whom he identifies with the Wicked Priest). During the period of 150–100 B.C.E., there were only about fifty Essenes at Qumran, but thereafter the number increased to about two hundred, perhaps an indication that many Pharisees sought refuge from Alexander Jannaeus. The earthquake of 31 B.C.E. caused the Essenes to leave Qumran, but they returned about the beginning of the Christian Era, and remained there until the Roman occupation of 68–69. This reconstruction from beginning to end, starting from the assumption that the Essenes are the Dead Sea Sect, is highly hypothetical.

GORANSON (2456b), on the basis of comments in Philo, Josephus, Pliny, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Coptic Apocalypse of Elijah, the Hebrew Elijah Apocalypse, the Christian historian Orosius, and archaeology, theorizes that the Essenes may have lived on Mount Carmel.

## 22.25: The Relationship of the Essenes to Other Movements: the Herodians

- (2457) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Les 'Hérodiens' du Nouveau Testament sont-ils des Esséniens? In: *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1967–69, pp. 31–53.

- (2458) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Nouveaux Arguments en faveur de l'identification des Hérodians et des Esséniens. In: *Revue de Qumran* 7, 1969–71, pp. 397–402.
- (2459) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Les Esséniens et 'Ceux qui sont dans les maisons des rois' (Matthieu 11, 7–8 et Luc 7, 24–25). In: *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1967–69, pp. 261–277.
- (2460) JOSEPH N. DERENBOURG: Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine, d'après les *Thalmuds* et les autres sources rabbiniques. Première partie: Histoire de la Palestine depuis Cyrus jusqu'à Adrien. Paris 1867.
- (2461) LOUIS GINZBERG: *On Jewish Law and Lore*. Philadelphia 1955, 1962.
- (2462) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *Greek in Jewish Palestine*. New York 1942.
- (2462a) YIGAL YADIN: Militante Herodianer aus Qumran. Die Essener zwingen Christen und Juden zum Umdenken. In: *Lutherische Monatshefte* 18, 1979, pp. 355–358.

DANIEL (2457) (2458) presents as arguments to prove the identification of the Herodians with the Essenes the facts that the Essenes were also political in character as reflected in War 2. 140, that the Essene priests must have been the majority of those who helped Herod build his temple, that they possessed collective wealth at Qumran even if as individuals they were poor, thus showing that they had political protection, and that Rabba in the fourth century reports that in the time of Hillel (first century) Menahem the Essene left the Sanhedrin with 160 disciples for royal service (which he identifies with the service of Herod). The term Herodians, he asserts, is an unflattering name given to the group by its enemies. He (2459) identifies the Essenes with those who are in kings' houses (in whom he sees Herodians) and in the wilderness, since, he says, the only members of a sect who lived in the desert and were linked with the family of Herod were the Essenes. He explains the discovery at Masada of writings previously known at Qumran by suggesting that certain Essenes lived at Masada as protégés of Herod, who built the fortress there, and of his descendants. He concludes that all the characteristics of the Herodians accord perfectly with the Essenes. We may comment that War 2. 140, far from indicating their political character, merely states that they accept the rule of the government on the grounds that the ruler could not have attained his office without divine consent. There is, moreover, no evidence in Josephus or elsewhere that there were any Essene priests among those who helped Herod build his temple. Again, even if we accept the questionable identification of the Essenes with the Dead Sea Sect, there is no evidence that it was impossible to attain wealth at this time except by political protection. Finally, the Talmud (*Ḥagigah* 16 b) speaks only of Menahem; the identification of him as an Essene is a conjecture adopted by DERENBOURG (2460), pp. 464–465, and GINZBERG (2461), p. 101; but we may comment that the name Menahem is such a common one that the fact that he is contemporary of Hillel is hardly sufficient to warrant the identification with Menahem the Essene in Josephus (*Ant.* 15. 373–378). A fuller, alternate text of the Talmudic narrative (*Midrash*, 'Shir ha-Shirim Zuta', end) records Menahem's leaving with eight hundred students dressed in golden scale armor, and states that his brother murdered a certain Hanin ben Matron (perhaps μέτριος, "the moderate"), and that Eleazar, presumably an associate of Menahem, and his men murdered a certain Elhanan.

LIEBERMAN (2462), pp. 179–184, suggests more plausibly the identification of the Talmudic Menahem with Menahem the son of Judas the Galilean (War 2.

433–448), who was responsible for the murder of the high priest Ananias, though there is still the problem of chronology, since the rabbis' Menahem is a contemporary of Hillel, who lived at the end of the first century B.C.E. and not at the beginning of the first century C.E.

With regard to DANIEL's (2457) (2458) statement linking the Essenes with the house of Herod, we may ask why, if this is so, some Essenes were tortured during the revolution (War 2. 152–153), since the Jewish royal house was allied with the Romans. Again, the reference to kings' houses is part of Jesus' usual imagery with regard to the kingdom. As to DANIEL's conclusion that all the characteristics of the Herodians are shared by the Essenes, this is, to say the least, an exaggeration, since the New Testament, the sole contemporary source that speaks of the Herodians, mentions only their association with the Pharisees as enemies of Jesus (Matthew 22. 16, Mark 3. 6, 12. 13) and tells nothing of their beliefs or practices. If, indeed, Epiphanius (*Adversus Haereses* 1. 20) is right in stating that they regarded Herod as the Messiah (though there is no inkling of this in either Josephus or the New Testament), this would be one respect, surely, in which they differed with the Essenes. Moreover, there is no indication in either the New Testament or the Church Fathers that they were monastic or communistic. As for the presence of Essene documents at Masada, the sect that presumably left these writings were, at least according to Josephus, Sicarii, who came to Masada long after Herod in 66 C.E. (War 2. 408).

YADIN (2462a) suggests that the term 'Herodians' probably censured the Essenes for accepting the protection of Herod.

## 22.26: The Essenes and Hermeticism, Gnosticism, the Therapeutae, and the Essenes of Ephesus

- (2463) FRANÇOIS-MARIE BRAUN: *Essénisme et Hermétisme: A propos de l'œuvre du Père Festugière*. In: *Revue Thomiste* 54, 1954, pp. 523–558.
- (2464) RALPH MARCUS: *The Qumran Scrolls and Early Judaism*. In: *Biblical Research* 1, 1956, pp. 9–47.
- (2465) GERSHOM G. SCHOLEM: *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*. New York 1941, 1946, 1954.
- (2466) GEZA VERMES: *Essenes-Therapeutai-Qumran*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 2, 1960, pp. 97–115.
- (2467) GEZA VERMES: *Essenes and Therapeutai*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 3, 1961–62, pp. 495–504. Rpt. in: GEZA VERMES, *Post-Biblical Studies*. Leiden 1975. Pp. 30–36.
- (2468) HANS-G. SCHÖNFELD: *Zum Begriff "Therapeutai" bei Philon von Alexandrien*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 3, 1961–62, pp. 219–240.
- (2469) YITZHAK F. BAER: *The Historical Foundations of the Halacha (in Hebrew)*. In: *Zion* 17, 1952, pp. 1–55.
- (2469a) EDWARD EARLE ELLIS: *Prophecy and Hermeneutic in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 18)*. Tübingen 1978. Rpt. Grand Rapids 1978.

BRAUN (2463) notes that Essenes share with Hermeticism the concept of the dichotomy of body and soul (War 2. 154–158), the pure religion of the

spirit (Ant. 18. 19), the prayer to the sun (War 2. 128), and piety and knowledge (War 2. 119, 2. 136), but he declines to conclude that there is any direct connection. BRAUN notes that the Essenes as described by Josephus are relatively later and suggests that they were more truly Jewish at an earlier time; we may comment that the chief factor here is that Josephus is describing the Essenes in Greek terms for a Greek audience. As to the Hermetic writings, so far as we have them, they date, we must remember, from the fourth to the eleventh centuries C.E. Moreover, motifs such as the dichotomy of body and soul are Platonic in origin, as indeed Josephus' language (War 2. 154), which speaks of the soul in the prison-house of the body, shows. There is no indication in Josephus, we may add, beyond the commonplace that the souls are borne aloft, that the Essenes shared in the Hermetic concept of the ascent of the soul through the heavenly spheres, nor is there any sign that they shared the Hermetic cosmology or the idea of the Logos or the Anthropos. As to the prayer to the sun, this is merely an indication in Josephus, as noted above, that the Essenes pray to the East. The other features are too common to be distinctive.

MARCUS (2464) sees a close connection of the Essenes, the Dead Sea Sect, and the Gnostics; and he refers to the Essenes as gnosticizing Pharisees. But, aside from the fact that the Essenes (War 2. 141), like the Gnostics, do not reveal their secrets to others and speak of a dichotomy between body and soul (War 2. 154), both of which tenets are hardly restricted to these groups, there is scarcely anything distinctive shared by them. Of course, as we may note, Josephus says relatively little about the Essenes' theology, but in what he does say, and especially in the language, there is little to support MARCUS' equation. Much has been written on possible connections between the Gnostics and the Essenes; but, as SCHOLEM (2465), p. 359, the greatest authority on Jewish mysticism, wisely writes: "I do not propose to dwell on . . . the voluminous literature on the subject of the Essenes, which has become the happy hunting-ground of those who delight in hypotheses."

VERMES (2466) (2467) follows Philo (*De Vita Contemplativa* 1) in regarding the Essenes and the Therapeutae as being inspired by the same religious ideal, while viewing the former as seeking to fulfill it by the active life and the latter by contemplation. By deriving the etymology of Essenes from Aramaic *'aseya*, "healer", VERMES makes them similar to the Therapeutae, whose name definitely means "healers". SCHÖNFELD (2468) attacks this equation by saying that they were not physicians; but VERMES properly replies that they were spiritual healers.

In a far-fetched suggestion, BAER (2469) compares the Essenes with the Essenes of Ephesus.

ELLIS (2469a), pp. 82 and 91–92, discusses the Gnostic tendencies within the Essenes. He notes the significance of the fact that Josephus, when he deals with the Jewish sects, does not mention any Oriental or Gnostic philosophy.

## 22.27: The Essenes and the Dacians

- (2470) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: On a Passage of Josephus Relating to the Essenes (Antiq. XVIII. 22). In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 1, 1956, pp. 361–366.
- (2471) JEAN CARMIGNAC: Conjecture sur un passage de Flavius Josèphe relatif aux Esséniens. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 7, 1957, pp. 318–319.
- (2472) HEINZ KRUSE: Noch einmal zur Josephus-Stelle Antiqu. 18. 1. 5. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 9, 1959, pp. 31–39.
- (2473) JEAN GAGÉ: Du culte thrace de Pleistoros à la secte dace des ‘Pleistoi.’ A propos d’une dédicace épigraphique à Diana Plestrensis. In: *Noul Album Macedo-Român* 1, Freiburg 1959, pp. 15–26.
- (2474) E. LOZOVAN: Les Πλείστοι. Des Carpathes à Qoumrân. In: *Acta Philosophica et Theologica* 2, Roma, Soc. acad. Dacoromana, 1964, pp. 181–189.
- (2475) E. LOZOVAN: Les pleistoi daces – moines abstinents? In: *Orpheus* 11, 1964, pp. 141–147.
- (2476) E. LOZOVAN: Dacia Sacra (trans. by SOFIA F. HADDAD). In: *History of Religions* 7, 1967–68, pp. 209–243.
- (2476a) STANLEY ISSER: The Conservative Essenes: A New Emendation of Antiquities XVIII. 2. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 7, 1976, pp. 177–180.
- (2476b) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965.

Josephus (Ant. 18. 22) hardly yields sense in comparing the Essenes to “the so-called majority of the Dacians” (Δακῶν τοῖς πλείστοις λεγομένοις). Various emendations have been suggested for πλείστοις, notably Ortelius’ Κτίσταις (the Ctistae were a tribe who, like the majority of the Essenes, lived without wives).

DUPONT-SOMMER (2470), assuming the identification of the Essenes with the Dead Sea Sectaries, keeps πλείστοις, since he sees a parallel in the familiar designation of the members of the Qumran Community as *ha-rabim*, “the many”. The meaning would then be that the various Essene groups closely conformed to the Qumran community, which served as a model for all. Since the Qumran sectaries called themselves “sons of Zadok”, he emends Δακῶν to Σαδῶκ, or, preferably, Σαδδουκαίων; the meaning would then be “conforming as much as possible to those of the Sadducees [to be distinguished from the classical Sadducees] who are called the Many.” But the emendation is palaeographically difficult; and we know of no such group of Sadducees. To identify these Sadducees with the Zadokites will, in any case, upset DUPONT-SOMMER’s theory that the Qumranites are to be identified with the Essenes, since the text would then read that the Essenes are very similar to and hence not identical with the Sadducees.

CARMIGNAC (2471) avoids these objections by reading αὐτῶν for Δακῶν.

KRUSE (2472) remarks that *ha-rabim* cannot be rendered by πλείστοις, since the exact translation would be πολλοί; but, we may remark, Hebrew lacks a superlative, and hence *ha-rabim* may represent πλείστοις. He himself reads Σακῶν τοῖς Ποδισταῖς, thus making the reference to the Indian Sacae, who are called Buddhists, that is, Βουδισταῖς; but this is transcriptionally improbable.

GAGÉ (2473) keeps πλείστοις and translates “they are most similar to the Dacians called Pleistoi”. He connects the Pleistoi with the Thracian god Pleistoros (Herodotus 9. 119) and Diana Plestrensis and the place-name Pliska in

southern Dobruja in southeastern Rumania (which he connects with *pleisk*, the etymon of the Rumanian word *plisc*, “bird’s beak”). The theory is, to say the least, highly conjectural and built on hypothesis atop hypothesis; one cannot reach Olympus through piling such Pelions on Ossas.

LOZOVAN (2474) properly objects to GAGÉ’s theory as involving too many changes of letters and concludes that the only reading that satisfies palaeography, logic, and history is Δακῶν τοῖς πλείστοις. He then conjectures on possible relations between the religion of the Dacians and that of the Essenes. He suggests that the Dacian campaign of Domitian gave Josephus the idea of a parallel which would involve his book to a greater degree in current events; but, we may comment, a mere casual reference to the Dacians was hardly likely to arouse much more interest in his long work.

LOZOVAN (2475) (2476), connects πλείστοις with Thracian and Rumanian words, in particular with (the theoretically existent) Thracian *pleisk*, which goes back to (the theoretically existent) Indo-European *pleus*, “hair”. The bonnet, πῖλος, of the Dacians also refers to hair; hence πλείστοι is paronomasia for a barbarian word *pleiskoi*, which equals πιλοφόροι. Such conjectures, as we have indicated above, built on conjectures involving theoretically existent words, especially when palaeographically the words are so far apart, can hardly commend themselves. We may conclude that Ortelius’ suggestion, Κτίσταις, still seems best, or, failing that, a very similar reading, σκίσταις, “separated, isolated, celibate”, which LOZOVAN (2476) mentions in passing.

ISSER (2476a), noting the statement in Epiphanius, Panarion 10. 1–2, that the Essenes lived in their original way of life, adding nothing to it, and the statement in Josephus (Ant. 18. 20) that their qualities were unparalleled among Greeks or barbarians, emends the phrase Δακῶν τοῖς πλείστοις (Ant. 18. 22) to αὐτῶν τοῖς παλαιοῖς, and translates “they lived not differently from, but rather as similarly as possible to, those called their ancients.” He objects to my (2476b) adoption of Ortelius’ emendation Κτίσταις on the grounds that the Ctistae were not well known to the reading public and that Josephus has precluded analogies with Greeks and barbarians. We may, however, reply that in addition to the fact that ISSER’s emendation is hard to justify palaeographically, Josephus does not say that the manner of life of the Essenes is unparalleled among other peoples, but rather that their qualities of character are unparalleled.

## 22.28: The Essenes and the Magi

(2476c) MARTIN MCNAMARA: Were the Magi Essenes? In: Irish Ecclesiastical Record 110, 1968, pp. 305–328.

MCNAMARA (2476c), on the basis of Josephus’ description of the Essenes and his presentation of Herod, unconvincingly argues that the Magi (Matthew 2. 1–12) are identical with the Essenes.

**22.29: The Relationship of the Essenes to the Dead Sea Sect**

- (2477) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: *Aperçus préliminaires sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte*. Paris 1950.
- (2478) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: *Observations sur le Manuel de Discipline découvert près de la Mer Morte*. Paris 1951.
- (2479) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: *Nouveaux Aperçus sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*. Paris 1953.
- (2480) WILLIAM H. BROWNLEE: The Historical Allusions of the Dead Sea Habakkuk Midrash. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 126, April 1952, pp. 10–20.
- (2481) ROGER GOOSSENS: La secte de la Nouvelle Alliance et les Esséniens. In: *Le Flambeau* 35, 1952, pp. 145–154.
- (2482) RALPH MARCUS: Philo, Josephus, and the Dead Sea Yahad. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71, 1952, pp. 207–209.
- (2483) YEHOASHUA M. GRINTZ: The Men of the Community – Essenes (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 32, 1953, pp. 11–43. Trans. into German in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed., *Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84)*. Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 294–336.
- (2484) GEORG MOLIN: Die Rollen von 'En Fešha und ihre Stellung in der jüdischen Religionsgeschichte. In: *Judaica* (Zürich) 7, 1951, pp. 161–213.
- (2485) GEORG MOLIN: Die Söhne des Lichtes. Zeit und Stellung der Handschriften vom Toten Meer. Wien 1954.
- (2486) SAUL LIEBERMAN: The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71, 1952, pp. 199–206. Rpt. in his: *Texts and Studies*. New York 1974. Pp. 200–207.
- (2487) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: The Internal Dating of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 28, 1952, pp. 257–276.
- (2488) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: *The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford 1952.
- (2489) KURT SCHUBERT: Die jüdischen und judenchristlichen Sekten im Lichte des Handschriftenfundes von 'En Fešcha. In: *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie* 74, 1952, pp. 1–62.
- (2490) MATTHIAS DELCOR: Contribution à l'étude de la législation des sectaires de Damas et de Qumrân. In: *Revue Biblique* 61, 1954, pp. 533–553.
- (2491) MOSHE H. GOTTSTEIN (GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN): Anti-Essene Traits in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 4, 1954, pp. 141–147.
- (2492) MILLAR BURROWS: *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. With translations by the author. New York 1955. Trans. into Portuguese: *Os Documentos do Mar Morto*; tradução de IRONDINO TEIXEIRA DE AGUIAR. Porto 1956. Trans. into French by M. GLOTZ and M.-T. FRANCK. Paris 1957. Trans. into German by FRIEDRICH CORNELIUS: *Die Schriftenrollen vom Toten Meer*. München 1957. Trans. into Swedish by HELMER RINGGREN: *Skriftfynden vid Döda havet*. Stockholm 1957. Trans. into Hungarian: *A Holttengeri tekercsek; fűggelékben: a tekercsek fordítása*. Budapest 1961.
- (2493) ARTHUR POWELL DAVIES: *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. New York 1956. Trans. into German by FRED and JESSICA SCHMITZ: *Der Fund von Qumran: Die Schriftrollen vom Toten Meer und die Bibel*. Wiesbaden 1957.
- (2494) HANS J. KANDLER: Zum Problem des Verhältnisses der Sekte von Chirbet Qumran zu den Essenern. In: KURT SCHUBERT, JOHANNES BOTTERWECK and JOHANN KNOBLOCH, edd., *Festschrift für Viktor Christian*. Wien 1956. Pp. 55–65.
- (2495) ANTONIO GONZÁLEZ LAMADRID: *Los descubrimientos de Qumrán*. Madrid 1956.
- (2496) WILLIAM S. LA SOR: *Amazing Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Faith*. Chicago 1956; rev. ed., 1959.
- (2497) MARTIN NOTH: *Geschichte Israels*. Göttingen 1950; 6th ed., 1966. Trans. into English by STANLEY GODMAN: *The History of Israel*. London 1958; 2nd ed., 1960.



- (2498) BLEDDYN J. ROBERTS: The Qumrân Scrolls and the Essenes. In: *New Testament Studies* 3, 1956–57, pp. 58–65.
- (2499) HUGH J. SCHONFIELD: *Secrets of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Studies towards their Solution*. London 1956.
- (2500) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Modern Scholarship*. Philadelphia 1956.
- (2501) HERBERT BRAUN: *Spätjüdisch-häretischer und frühchristlicher Radikalismus. Jesus von Nazareth und die essenische Qumransekte*. 2 vols. Tübingen 1957.
- (2502) MILLAR BURROWS: *More Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls: New Scrolls and New Interpretations with Translations of Important Recent Discoveries*. New York 1958. Trans. into German by FRIEDRICH CORNELIUS: *Mehr Klarheit über die Schriftrollen*. München 1958.
- (2503) CECIL ROTH: Why the Qumran Sect Cannot Have Been Essenes. In: *Revue de Qumran* 1, 1958–59, pp. 417–422.
- (2504) CECIL ROTH: Were the Qumran Sectaries Essenes? A Re-examination of Some Evidences. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 10, 1959, pp. 87–93.
- (2505) CECIL ROTH: The Religious Nature of the Zealots. In: MENAHEM H. KASHER, NORMAN LAMM, and LEONARD ROSENFELD, edd., *Leo Jung Jubilee Volume*. New York 1962. Pp. 203–209.
- (2506) KURT SCHUBERT: *Die Gemeinde vom Toten Meer. Ihre Entstehung und ihre Lehren*. München 1958. English trans. by JOHN W. DOBERSTEIN: *The Dead Sea Community: Its Origin and Teachings*. London 1959.
- (2507) JOHN STRUGNELL: Flavius Josephus and the Essenes: *Antiquities XVIII*. 18–22. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 77, 1958, pp. 106–115.
- (2508) KARL G. KUHN: Der gegenwärtige Stand der Erforschung der in Palästina neugefundenen hebräischen Handschriften. 43. Zum heutigen Stand der Qumrânforschung. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 85, 1960, pp. 649–658.
- (2509) WILLIAM S. LA SOR, forward: Josephus, *Complete Works*. translated by WILLIAM WHISTON. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1960.
- (2510) KARL H. RENGSTORF: *Hirbet Qumrân und die Bibliothek vom Toten Meer*. Stuttgart 1960. Trans. (abridged) into English by J. R. WILKIE: *Hirbet Qumran and the Problem of the Library of the Dead Sea Caves*. Leiden 1963.
- (2511) EDMUND F. SUTCLIFFE: *The Monks of Qumran as Depicted in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London 1960.
- (2512) MATTHEW BLACK: *The Essene Problem*. London 1961.
- (2513) CECIL ROTH, rev.: MATTHEW BLACK, *The Essene Problem*. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 94, 1962, pp. 157–159.
- (2514) JAMES KELSO: *The Archaeology of Qumran*. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 74, 1955, pp. 141–147.
- (2515) MATTHEW BLACK: *The Scrolls and Christian Origins. Studies in the Jewish Background of the New Testament*. London 1961.
- (2516) JOSHUA M. GRINTZ: The War Scroll – Its Time and Its Authors (in Hebrew). In: CHAIM RABIN and YIGAL YADIN, edd., *Essays on the Dead Sea Scrolls in Memory of Eliezer L. Sukenik*. Jerusalem 1961. Pp. 19–30.
- (2517) ROLAND K. HARRISON: *The Dead Sea Scrolls*. London 1961.
- (2518) JOHANNES HEMPEL: Weitere Mitteilungen über Text und Auslegung der am Nordwestende des Toten Meeren gefundenen hebräischen Handschriften. In: *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, 1: *Philologisch-historische Klasse*, 1961, no. 10, pp. 281–374.
- (2519) GÖSTA LINDESKOG: *Esséerna och Kristendomen* (with German summary). In: *Annales Academiae Regiae Scientiarum Upsaliensis* 5, 1961, pp. 103–147.
- (2520) JACQUES SCHREIDEN: *Les Énigmes des Manuscrits de la Mer Morte*. Wetteren, Belgium, 1961; 2nd augmented ed., 1964.

- (2521) ROLAND DE VAUX: *L'Archéologie et les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (Schweich Lectures, 1959). London 1961.
- (2522) DAVID FLUSSER: The Sects of the Desert of Judah and Their Era (in Hebrew). In: *Maḥanaim* 62, 1962, p. 22.
- (2523) ANTHONY N. GILKES: *The Impact of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. London 1962.
- (2524) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu*. Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte. Leipzig 1923; 3rd ed., Göttingen 1962. Trans. into French (based on 3rd ed.) by JEAN LEMOYNE: *Jérusalem au temps de Jésus, recherches d'histoire économique et sociale pour la période néotestamentaire*. Paris 1967. Trans. into English (based on 3rd ed.) by F. H. and C. H. CAVE: *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus; An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. Philadelphia 1969.
- (2525) MORDECAI PIRON: The Sects in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: *Maḥanayim* 62, 1962, pp. 16–21.
- (2526) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Die frühchristliche Überlieferung über die Herkunft der Familie des Herodes. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der politischen Invektive in Judäa. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 1, 1962, pp. 109–160.
- (2527) ISTVAN HAHN: Josephus und die Eschatologie von Qumran. In: HANS BARDTKE, ed., *Qumran-Probleme* (Vorträge des Leipziger Symposions über Qumran-Probleme vom 9. bis 14. Oktober 1961. Berlin 1963. Pp. 167–191.
- (2528) HELMER RINGGREN: *Israelitische Religion*. Stuttgart 1963. Trans. into English by DAVID E. GREEN: *Israelite Religion*. Philadelphia 1966.
- (2529) SUITBERT H. SIEDL: *Qumran. Eine Mönchsgemeinde im Alten Bund*. Studie über Serek ha-Yahad (Bibliotheca Carmelita, Series 2, Studia, vol. 2). Rome 1963.
- (2530) EDUARD LOHSE, ed.: *Die Texte aus Qumran, hebräisch und deutsch, mit masoretischer Punctuation. Übersetzung, Einführung und Anmerkungen*. Darmstadt 1964.
- (2531) MENAHEM MANSOOR: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A College Textbook and a Study Guide*. Leiden 1964.
- (2532) GODFREY R. DRIVER: *The Judean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution*. Oxford 1965.
- (2533) ROLAND DE VAUX: Esséniens ou Zélotes? A Propos d'un Livre Récent. In: *Revue Biblique* 73, 1966, pp. 212–235.
- (2534) ROLAND DE VAUX: The Judean Scrolls. 2. Essenes or Zealots? In: *New Testament Studies* 13, 1966–67, pp. 89–104 (trans. of [2533]).
- (2535) GODFREY R. DRIVER: Myths of Qumran. In: *Annual of the Leeds University Oriental Society* 6, 1966–68, pp. 23–48.
- (2536) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: Deux documents horoscopiques esséniens découverts à Qoumrân, près de la Mer Morte. In: *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, 1965, pp. 239–253.
- (2537) LEAH BRONNER: *Sects and Separatism During the Second Jewish Commonwealth: A study of the origin of Religious Separatism with special reference to the rise, growth and development of the various Sects, including the Dead Sea Community (originally a thesis for a Master's degree at the University of Witwatersrand, South Africa)*. New York 1967.
- (2538) DAVID S. RUSSELL: *The Jews from Alexander to Herod* (The New Clarendon Bible, Old Testament, 5). London 1967.
- (2539) HUGH ANDERSON: The Intertestamental Period. In: WILLIAM BARCLAY et al., edd., *The Bible and History*. London 1968. Pp. 153–244.
- (2540) MOSHE PERLMUTER: The Qumran Sect and the Essenes (in Hebrew). In: *Basha'ar* 11, 1968, pp. 138–147.
- (2541) E. J. PRYKE: The Identity of the Qumran Sect: A Reconsideration. In: *Novum Testamentum* 10, 1968, pp. 43–61.

- (2542) MARCEL SIMON and ANDRÉ BENOIT: *Le Judaïsme et le Christianisme antique d'Antiochus Épiphane à Constantin* (Nouvelle Clío, 10). Paris 1968.
- (2543) JOHANN MAIER: *Geschichte der jüdischen Religion von der Zeit Alexander des Grossen bis zur Aufklärung, mit einem Ausblick auf das 19./20. Jahrhundert*. Berlin 1972.
- (2543a) WILLIAM H. BROWNLEE: *A Comparison of the Covenanters of the Dead Sea Scrolls with Pre-Christian Jewish Sects*. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 13, 1950, pp. 49–72.
- (2543aa) ROBERT H. CHARLES: *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. Vol. 2: *Pseudepigrapha*. Oxford 1913.
- (2543b) STANISLAV SEGERT: *Die Gütergemeinschaft der Essäer*. In: *Festschrift Antonin Salač* (Československá akademie věd. Sekce jazyka a literatury. Sborník filologický 3,1). Prag 1955. Pp. 66–73.
- (2543c) CHARLES T. FRITSCH: *The Qumrān Community: Its History and Scrolls*. New York 1956.
- (2543d) BERTIL GÄRTNER: *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. Cambridge 1965.
- (2543e) HARTMUT STEGEMANN: *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Diss., Bonn 1965. Publ.: Bonn 1971.
- (2543f) EDMOND B. SZÉKELY: *The Essene Code of Life, as followed by the brotherhoods at the Dead Sea and Lake Mareotis, from the original Aramaic and French translation composed, translated and edited*. San Diego 1971.
- (2543g) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: *The History of the Qumran Sect*. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 49, 1966–67, pp. 203–232.
- (2543h) ROBERT B. WRIGHT: *Sacrifice in the Intertestamental Literature*. Diss., Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford 1966.
- (2543i) FRANK M. CROSS: *The Early History of the Qumran Community*. In: *McCormick Quarterly* 21, 1968, pp. 249–264.
- (2543j) MATTHIAS DELCOR: *The Courts of the Church of Corinth and the Courts of Qumran*. In: JEROME MURPHY-O'CONNOR, ed., *Paul and Qumran. Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Chicago 1968. Pp. 69–84.
- (2543k) WITOLD TYLOCH: *The Social Aspects of the Qumran Community in the Light of the Dead Sea Manuscripts and the Texts of the Ancient Authors* (in Polish) (*Rozprawy Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego*, 29). Diss., Univ. of Warsaw 1968. Publ.: Warsaw 1968.
- (2543l) LUIGI MORALDI: *Studio e Conoscenza delle Regole degli Esseni di Qumrān*. In: *Quaderni della rivista Bibbia e Oriente* 13, 1971, pp. 199–209.
- (2543m) SHMARYAHU TALMON: *The New Covenanters of Qumran*. In: *Scientific American* 225.5, 1971, pp. 73–81.
- (2543n) JOHANN MAIER and KURT SCHUBERT: *Die Qumran-Essener. Texte der Schriftrollen und Lebensbild der Gemeinde*. München 1973.
- (2543o) JAMES A. SANDERS: *The Dead Sea Scrolls – A Quarter Century of Study*. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 36, 1973, pp. 109–148.
- (2543p) LAWRENCE H. SCHIFFMAN: *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Diss., 2 vols., Brandeis Univ., Waltham, Mass. 1974. Publ.: Leiden 1975.
- (2543q) YIGAEEL YADIN: *The Gate of the Essenes and the Temple Scroll*. In: YIGAEEL YADIN, ed., *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974* (trans. and abridged by R. GRAFMAN). Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 90–91.
- (2543r) PESSAH BAR-ADON: *Another Settlement of the Judean Desert Sect at 'En el-Ghuweir on the Shores of the Dead Sea*. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 227, 1977, pp. 1–25.
- (2543s) J. H. ULRICHSEN: *Troen på et liv etter døden: Qumrantekstene* (= *Belief in a Life*

- after Death in the Qumran Texts) (in Norwegian). In: Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift 78, 1977, pp. 151–163.
- (2543t) GEZA VERMES: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. London 1977; Cleveland 1978.
- (2543u) JAN BUITKAMP: *Die Auferstehungsvorstellungen in den Qumrantexten und ihr alttestamentlicher, apokryphischer, pseudepigraphischer und rabbinischer Hintergrund*. Diss., Rijkuniversiteit Groningen 1964. Publ.: Groningen 1965.
- (2543v) ROY A. ROSENBERG: Who Is the More haššedeq? In: *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 36, 1968, pp. 118–122.
- (2543w) BARUCH SHARVIT: *The Place of Study in the Judean Desert Sect* (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 18, 1972–73, pp. 488–493.
- (2543x) BARUCH SHARVIT: *Virtue of Wisdom in the Image of the Zaddik in the Manual of Discipline* (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 19, 1973–74, pp. 526–530.
- (2543y) LOUIS GINZBERG: *Eine unbekannte jüdische Sekte*. New York 1922; rpt. Hildesheim 1972. Trans. into English by RALPH MARCUS et al.: *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (Moreshet Series, 1). New York 1976.
- (2543z) DONALD E. GOWAN: *Bridge between the Testaments: A Reappraisal of Judaism from the Exile to the Birth of Christianity* (Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 14). Pittsburgh 1976.
- (2543za) BARUCH SHARVIT: *The Sabbath of the Judean Desert Sect* (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 21, 1975–76, pp. 507–516. Trans. into English and condensed in: *Immanuel* 9, 1979, pp. 42–48.
- (2543zb) JACOB LICHT: *The Qumran Sect and Its Scrolls*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (The World History of the Jewish people, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 125–152, 352–360.
- (2543zc) BARUCH SHARVIT: *The Priest in the Judean Desert Sect* (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 22, 1976–77, pp. 313–320.
- (2543zd) JOSEPH COPPENS: *Le célibat essénien*. In: MATTHIAS DELCOR, ed., *Qumrân: Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 46). Paris 1978. Pp. 295–303.
- (2543ze) JOHANN MAIER: *Die Tempelrolle vom Toten Meer*. Übersetzt und erläutert. München 1978.
- (2543zf) JACOB MILGROM: *Studies in the Temple Scroll*. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 97, 1978, pp. 501–523.
- (2543zg) JEAN STARCKY: *Les Maîtres de Justice et la chronologie de Qumrân*. In: MATTHIAS DELCOR, ed., *Qumrân. Sa piété, sa théologie et son milieu* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium, 46). Paris 1978. Pp. 249–256.
- (2543zh) BARBARA E. THIERING: *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology and Religion, 1). Sydney 1979.

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has produced a whole series of attempts by specialists, who have been facetiously termed *Scrollers*, to identify the sect described in the Dead Sea ‘Manual of Discipline’ with the Essenes, for whom the passages in Josephus had hitherto been the chief source.

Most notable among the early scholars making this identification was DUPONT-SOMMER (2477), pp. 105–117, (2478), who (2479) connected the word ‘*eshah* (“party”)’ in the ‘Manual of Discipline’ with the word Essenes, who were the party par excellence. Among the points of similarity we may note: 1) the location near the Dead Sea; 2) the monastic-like separatist organization with a graded novitiate; 3) a strict rule of discipline demanding absolute obedience to superior officers; 4) frequent ablutions; 5) a strongly negative attitude toward

sex; 6) absolutely meticulous observance of the Sabbath; and 7) a prohibition against spitting in the midst of the assembly or to the right.

DUPONT-SOMMER was soon joined by BROWNLEE (2480), GOOSSENS (2481), and MARCUS (2482). GRINTZ (2483) systematically compared Josephus' account of the Essenes in the 'War' with the Dead Sea Sect in parallel columns and concluded by saying that they were identical. When objections were raised about discrepancies between the sect described in the Scrolls and the Essenes, MOLIN (2484) (2485) answered by noting that the Dead Sea Scrolls dated from at least a century earlier, that Philo and Josephus may have depended upon other writers as well as upon their own experience, and that they had Hellenized their accounts for the sake of their Greco-Roman readers.

BROWNLEE (2480) not only identified the Sect with the Essenes but also identified the Sect's Teacher of Righteousness with Judas the Essene, who, according to Josephus (Ant. 13. 311–318), had prophesied the death of Antigonos, the brother of Aristobulus I. Both, he notes, were teachers with disciples awaiting their messages, both made prophecies about imminent events, both were hostile to the official priesthood, and both accounts were placed in the Temple area. We may comment that there is nothing in Josephus to indicate that Judas was particularly hostile to the official priesthood, nor is the Temple the setting of the Teacher of Righteousness; but even if all of these points of resemblance were valid, they are really rather common and hardly prove identity. BROWNLEE is more careful in declining to identify the Scrolls' Wicked Priest with any one individual; rather he identifies him with all the kings from John Hyrcanus to Aristobulus II.

In an important article, LIEBERMAN (2486), after noting many parallels between the Sectaries and the Talmudic *ḥaburah*, sanely concludes that it is precarious to identify them with any of the three known sects, though he admits that there are many points of similarity with the Essenes.

ROWLEY (2487) (2488) explains the disagreements between the Scrolls and the accounts of Philo and Josephus by theorizing that either the Sect is an early group out of which the Essenes (the testimony about whom comes from a somewhat later period) and others may have grown or that they are actually Essenes in an earlier stage of their development than appears in Philo and Josephus. We may comment that extremist groups such as the Essenes or the Dead Sea Sect generally are averse to all change; and inasmuch as the Scrolls apparently date from approximately the period of Philo and Josephus, it seems hardly likely, if they were the same sect, that they would develop the changes that appear to differentiate them.

SCHUBERT (2489) agrees that the points of similarity between the Covenanters and the Essenes are so numerous and cover such a wide range that they must belong to the same sect type. To explain the differences he suggests that the name Essenes may have been applied to several similar but quite distinct groups. Thus Josephus himself speaks of two distinct groups of Essenes, one of which married while the other did not. We may respond that both Philo (Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 75) and Josephus (Ant. 18. 20) give their number as

“more than four thousand”; and if this number, which is so small, is accurate, it would be hard to suppose that they included very many sub-groups.

DELCOR (2490) notes that Josephus (War 2. 145, 2. 152) speaks of the awe with which the Essenes revered the name of their lawgiver and asks who this lawgiver may be. The temptation is to identify him with the Sect’s Teacher of Righteousness, but DELCOR wisely adheres to the traditional explanation that the lawgiver is Moses, since that is the name given to Moses in rabbinic literature also. We may add that in Josephus “the lawgiver”, without qualification, as here in connection with the Essenes or in Antiquities 1. 18 (where he is soon identified) or Against Apion 2. 154, is always Moses.

GOTTSTEIN (2491) concludes that the only similarity between the Dead Sea Sect and the Essenes is that they were both religious monastic sects. He notes, however, several important differences: 1) they have diametrically opposed conceptions of purity and purification (the Essenes believed that they alone were pure); 2) there was only one initiation for the Essenes, but the Sect had initiations of an annual birth type; 3) among the Essenes the maximum punishment was death, whereas in the Sect it was expulsion from the Sect; 4) the Essenes possessed no private property, whereas members of the Sect did. We may comment that Josephus (War 2. 143) speaks of expulsion from the order as the penalty for those convicted of serious crimes. We may add to this list of differences: 1) the Sect had a solar calendar, whereas the fact that Josephus says nothing about so important a matter as the calendar would seem to indicate that the Essenes agreed with the other Jews in this; 2) the Sect, to judge from the Zadokite Document, believed that sacrifices should be made in the Temple, whereas the Essenes (Ant. 18. 19), though the text is disputed, apparently disagreed with the manner in which the sacrifices were to be performed there; 3) there is nothing in Josephus to indicate that the Essenes are sons of Zadok or that they had a new covenant in Damascus or that they claimed to be the true Israel; 4) the priests are more prominent in Qumran; 5) there is no mention in Josephus of the key figure in the Sect, the Teacher of Righteousness; 6) the Essenes prohibited slavery, whereas the Qumran sect permitted it; 7) there are some differences in procedure for admitting new members, with the period of probation among the Essenes being both longer and stricter; 8) there is nothing in Qumran to indicate that the group prayed in the direction of the sun, as Josephus says the Essenes did; 9) Josephus describes the Essenes as having common meals, but there is no indications that these meals have a sacred character, as at Qumran; 10) Josephus describes the main Essene community as avoiding marriage in principle (War 2. 120), whereas women and children are named in the descriptions of the Qumran ‘congregation’ (though, we may comment, this may identify them as the schismatic community mentioned by Josephus, War 2. 160–161, who practiced marriage); 11) Josephus emphasizes the peaceful character of the Essenes (War 2. 135–136), whereas the Sect has a militaristic flavor.

BURROWS (2492), pp. 279–294, tries to explain Josephus’ silence about the Teacher of Righteousness or the new covenant by stating that Josephus was writing for a Gentile audience and that he consequently minimized everything peculiar to Judaism, while emphasizing every resemblance to Greek or Roman

thought. We may, however, reply that Josephus mentions many peculiarly Jewish features in connection with the Essenes, and that he was writing at least as much for the Greek-reading Jewish audience in the Diaspora as he was for the non-Jews. BURROWS concludes that the Essenes were left-wing Pharisees, inasmuch as the 'Damascus Document' shows the Pharisaic legal tradition; and yet, while he concludes that the Covenanters and the Essenes represented the same general type, he wisely refrains from identifying the Covenanters and the Essenes. Finally, he notes that the third-century Christian writer Hippolytus even says that some people called the Essenes Zealots and others called them Sicarii because they killed any uncircumcised man who talked about G-d and the Law. We may comment that this may reflect a tradition of another wing of an Essene or Essene-like sect; and the discovery at Masada of a scroll identical with one found in a Dead Sea community reflects such a sub-group.

DAVIES (2493), in a popular paperback, concludes that the Qumran community consisted of Essenes, but that its relationship to the rest of the movement, which he rightly notes had considerable variety in it and was not concentrated in any one area, can only be conjectured.

KANDLER (2494), noting numerous inconsistencies between the Sect and Josephus' and Philo's account of the Essenes, concludes that it belongs to the Essene range of sects without being identified with the particular type described by Josephus.

LAMADRID (2495), pp. 116–122, after a competent if unoriginal survey, decides that the sect is Essene.

LA SOR (2496), pp. 177–206, notes that the differences between the sect and the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Zealots are too great, and concludes that it is of the same general type as the Essenes.

Similarly, NOTH (2497), p. 400, says that the concept of the Essenes probably embraced a whole wealth of slightly differing sectarian groups.

ROBERTS (2498), accepting the identity of the Essenes and the sect, declares that the Dead Sea Scrolls are now the yardstick by which Philo and Josephus are to be measured. He admits, however, that Philo and Josephus do not reflect the outstanding characteristic of the Sectaries, their Bible-consciousness. We may add that Josephus had an ample opportunity to do so, for he does mention the Essenes' extraordinary interest in "the treatises (συντάγματα) of the ancients", and these are surely not the Biblical books.

SCHONFIELD (2499), in a work marked by bold conjectures, concludes, though without evidence, that the Covenanters were a distinct sect who, in their last phase, were associated with the Essenes.

ZEITLIN (2500) summarizes the differences between the Essenes and the Sect. He notes that Josephus never states that the Essenes lived near the Dead Sea, that only Pliny (*Naturalis Historia* 5. 73) locates them there, and that this reflects the fact that a remnant of the sect settled there in his period. We may comment that Dio Chrysostom (ap. Synesius, *Vita Dionis* [von Arnim, 2, p. 317]), a somewhat later contemporary of Pliny, also mentions the Essenes as "a whole blessed city situated near the Dea Sea", and that neither Pliny nor Dio indicates when the Essenes settled there.

BRAUN (2501), vol. 1, pp. 67–89, systematically refutes the attempt to identify the Sect as Essenes.

BURROWS (2502), pp. 263–274, in a popular account summarizing recent scholarship, concludes that either the Covenanters were Essenes proper (suggesting that the term may be used in a broad sense to include various sub-groups) or a group at a different stage in the history of the movement or a splinter group from the Essenes.

The identification of the Sectaries with the Essenes has been successfully attacked by ROTH (2503), who cites numerous differences, notably that the Sectaries were warlike, were not celibate (as were the main group of the Essenes), and prescribed oaths (though, we may note, the Essenes did take a number of mighty oaths upon joining the order, War 2. 139–142). Again, ROTH (2504) shows that, unlike the Sectaries, who clashed with the Wicked Priest (usually identified with one of the Hasmonean rulers), the Essenes are never reported to have clashed with any of the rulers of Palestine, however tyrannical.

ROTH (2505) also notes that whereas (War 2. 140) the Essenes compelled their initiates to swear fealty to those in authority, the Qumran sect was warlike; but, we may comment, there is no indication in the many scrolls thus far discovered that the Sectaries favored, let alone supported, the revolution against the Romans. Rather, their warlike stance seems to be theological and eschatological.

SCHUBERT (2506), who identifies the Sect as Essenes, explains the differences between them as due to the fact that Philo and Josephus wrote about the Essenes for Hellenistic readers and that Josephus is apologetic and hence suppressed aspects which would have created an unfavorable effect on Greek and Roman readers. But, we may comment, there was nothing to be gained apologetically in suppressing the fact that the group had a different calendar or had a Teacher of Righteousness or permitted slavery.

STRUGNELL (2507), assuming the identification of the Qumranites and Essenes – a questionable assumption, as noted above – as proved, uses the evidence of the Sect in choosing between equally possible interpretations of passages in Josephus' account. On this assumption, τοῦ δικαίου τὴν πρόσδοον (Ant. 18. 18) is best rendered "the approach to righteousness" or "the approach of the righteous one".

KUHN (2508) is sure that the Covenanters are Essenes and explains the differences between them by assuming that the ideas and practices of the Sect evolved.

LA SOR (2509), pp. x–xi, concludes that the Sect was in some way closely related to the Essenes but that there may be development in the group or that the Qumran sect is a divergent sect within the Essenes or that Josephus gives a distorted picture of the Essenes.

RENGSTROF (2510) says that the Sectaries are not Essenes but an outpost of the Temple rule.

SUTCLIFFE (2511) argues that if the followers of the Teacher of Righteousness had been distinct from the Essenes it would be strange for Josephus to have omitted all reference to them; but, we may reply, Josephus confined himself to the major sects, and he may have regarded the Dead Sea sect as too small and



unimportant to warrant special notice; we recall that the Talmud speaks of twenty-four sects.

BLACK (2512) qualifies his identification of the Qumran Sectaries with the Essenes by adding that the term 'Essenes' is general and embraces within it different but closely affiliated groups. We may add that an analogy to this is perhaps to be found in the fact that the terms 'Pharisees' and 'Fourth Philosophy' are likewise perhaps those of 'umbrella' groups embracing sub-groups of some diversity. As to discrepancies between Josephus and Qumran, BLACK asserts that Josephus presents us with a second-hand account of an outsider, no doubt largely dependent on hearsay, and that he selected and magnified one aspect of the group, their celibacy. We may comment that Josephus himself (Life 10) gained personal experience of each of the three sects, including the Essenes, and that he spent three years (Life 11) with a hermit named Bannus, who, if not an Essene, was very similar to one. As to magnifying the aspect of celibacy, Josephus, when he cites the sects for the first time (Ant. 13. 171–173), does not mention this at all, and even in the later account (Ant. 18. 18–22) refers to it very briefly (Ant. 18. 21) in passing. Even in the long account in the 'War' (2. 119–161) he has only two brief discussions of this matter (2. 120–121 and 2. 160–161), the second being devoted to the schismatic Essene group that did practice marriage. We may note, furthermore, that both Philo (Hypothetica 11. 14) and Pliny (Naturalis Historia 5. 73) likewise remark on the fact that the Essene have no women. BLACK admits that the Essenes were communistic whereas the Dead Sea Sect were not, but suggests that Josephus was trying to idealize the Essenes; but, we may comment, we find the same 'idealization' in Pliny and Philo. In addition, as ROTH (2513) has noted, BLACK fails to give sufficient weight to the fact that the Essenes were in principle loyal to political authority, whereas the Qumran sect was opposed to the rule of the secular 'Kittim'. Moreover, if KELSO (2514) is right in asserting that Qumran was destroyed in an earthquake in 31 B.C.E. and was abandoned for about thirty years, ROTH says that the identification with the Essenes is ruled out; but, we may comment, if, as Philo and Josephus indicate, there were many Essene outposts, Qumran may be one of those that happened to be destroyed.

BLACK (2515) traces back the Essenes to the desert tradition of the Nazirites and the Rechabites, and reaffirms the identification of the Qumranites as Essenes and the Teacher of Righteousness as the high priest Onias III. He asserts, though without evidence, that the Sect had close connections with the Samaritans, and claims, again without evidence, that there were also Essenes in Egypt. He correctly notes, however, that religiously Judaism in the first century was marked by widespread and dangerously proliferating and fissiparous heteropraxis.

GRINTZ (2516) associates the authors of the Dead Sea War Scroll with the group of apocalyptics, that is Essenes, who, according to Josephus (War 2. 258–260), led the masses into the desert to be delivered by G-d. But it is hard to believe that Josephus, who speaks so highly of the Essenes somewhat earlier in this book (War 2. 119–161), would speak so disparagingly of them here. In addition, it is usually Josephus' way to give a cross-reference when he mentions someone or a group that he has mentioned previously, and it is consequently unlikely that the

anonymous group in War 2. 258–260 is identical with the Essenes mentioned in 2. 119–161.

HARRISON (2517), in a useful and concise survey, notes important similarities and differences between the Dead Sea Sect and the Essenes.

HEMPEL (2518), pp. 366–367, concludes that we may identify the Qumranites with the Essenes provided that we understand that Josephus uses the term ‘Essenes’ to cover several branches of that sect.

LINDESKOG (2519), after reviewing the history of scholarship on the Essenes, identifies the Qumran sect with them, noting, in particular, that Josephus twice in his account (War 2. 145, 152) uses the term νομοθέτης, “lawgiver”, which in the Septuagint is used to translate *moreh*, “teacher”, and suggests that Josephus is perhaps thinking of the Qumranites’ *moreh ha-zedek*, “Teacher of Righteousness”; as we have noted above, however, the term in Josephus elsewhere clearly refers to Moses. Moreover, in War 2. 145, Josephus says that after G-d the Essenes hold most in awe the name of their lawgiver, and it is impossible to conceive that any Jew could hold any human being higher than Moses, so much so that eventually it is an article in Maimonides’ creed that Moses was the greatest of the prophets.

SCHREIDEN (2520), especially pp. 37–42, comments critically on the theories of DUPONT-SOMMER, GOOSENS, and VERMES identifying the Sectaries with the Essenes, as well as on ROTH’s theory identifying them with the Zealots.

DE VAUX (2521), pp. 96–104, after comparing Josephus’ report on the Essenes with the accounts of Philo and Pliny, identifies the Dead Sea group with the Essenes, explaining the discrepancies between Josephus’ version and the Scrolls by postulating an evolution of Essenism, as well as varied tendencies within the movement, and by noting that Josephus’ version comes from without and that of Qumran comes from within the movement.

FLUSSER (2522) sees in the Scrolls a corroboration of Josephus’ references to the Essenes.

GILKES (2523), pp. 97–108, in an account for laymen by a layman, concludes that the Essenes are a strong favorite for identification with the Dead Sea Sect.

JEREMIAS (2524), pp. 246–267, in a classic work, identifies the Qumran sect with the Essenes.

PIRON (2525) concludes that the question of identifying the Qumranites with the Essenes requires further investigation.

On the question of the identification of the Sect with the Essenes, SCHALIT (2526) wisely concludes that the last word is still to be spoken so long as we find no direct reference to the Essenes in the Scrolls themselves.

HAHN (2527) says that the Sectaries were Essenes with Zealot borrowings; we may comment that the fact that Josephus was so opposed to the Zealots may explain why he does not connect them with the Essenes, with whom Josephus was sympathetic. HAHN theorizes that there is a connection between the Sectaries’ interest in eschatology and chronology and that of the Essenes; but we may remark that there is no evidence in Josephus of eschatology as a major interest on the part of the Essenes, and there is no evidence of interest in chronology.

RINGGREN (2528), pp. 342–348, concludes that if the Sect and the Essenes are not identical, they are at least very closely related.

SIEDL (2529), pp. 314–315, likewise says that the Sectaries were either Essenes or very similar to them.

LOHSE (2530), in his commentary on the Scrolls, particularly the Rule of the Sect, cites very briefly (but generally without discussion) parallels and differences with Josephus.

MANSOOR (2531), pp. 143–152, accounts for the differences between the Scrolls and Josephus' description of the Essenes by suggesting that there were several communities of Essenes and that the Teacher of Righteousness may have founded a schismatic group of Essenes, by noting discrepancies among Josephus, Philo, and Pliny, and by asserting that Philo and Josephus intended their accounts for Gentile readers. We may comment that if, indeed, the Teacher of Righteousness founded a schismatic group of Essenes, we would expect denunciations of other Essene groups and, in particular, of their divergent practices, notably their attitude toward communism, the calendar, etc.; and we find no such denunciations in the many extant scrolls.

DRIVER (2532), pp. 100–121, noting a number of differences between the Essenes and the Covenanters, concludes that while the resemblances are superficial and shared with other parties of the period, the differences are often fundamental. He admits, however, that when Josephus (War 2. 160–161) mentions another order of Essenes who permitted matrimony, he may have confused them with the Covenanters, since such a characteristic runs counter to everything else which he reports about them; but, we may comment, the term 'Essenes', especially if it is the equivalent of Hasidim, "pious ones", may well cover a spectrum of groups. In answer to the question why Josephus did not mention the Covenanters, DRIVER, pp. 274–275, says that Josephus was not concerned to describe internal religious affairs; but, we may reply, the fact that he does describe the Essenes at length and that he does mention a schismatic group of Essenes who permitted marriage shows that Josephus, who admittedly is a historian rather than a theologian, does exhibit considerable interest in internal religious affairs so far as the Essenes are concerned.

DE VAUX (2533) (2534) has a sharp attack on DRIVER, noting a long list of addenda and especially corrigenda, and concerning himself especially with the interpretation of archaeological and chronological factors. In particular, he challenges DRIVER's contention that the identification of Qumran with the habitat of the Essenes noted by Pliny is impossible.

DRIVER (2535) answers DE VAUX, correctly arguing that even if the Essenes and Zadokites were both involved in the revolt, this would not necessarily identify the two groups, as DE VAUX contends. He asks, but does not satisfactorily answer, however, why the Scrolls have nothing to say about the Zealots (i. e. Sicarii) and Masada.

DUPONT-SOMMER (2536) notes a parallel between the Essenes' excellence in divination and that found in the Scrolls; we may comment, however, that divination is hardly restricted to the Essenes or Qumran, since, despite the clear prohibition against divination in the Bible (Deuteronomy 18. 10–11) we find

numerous references to such practices in the Talmud (e. g. *Hullin* 95b, *Ḥagigah* 15a) not merely on the part of ordinary people but even, for example, on the part of the famous Rabbi Johanan ben Zakkai, who, we are told, knew the language of palm-trees (*Sukkah* 28a).

BRONNER (2537), pp. 134–142, systematically notes both the similarities and differences between the Essenes and the Dead Sea Sect and concludes that the Sect is more closely akin to the Pharisees than to the Essenes. BRONNER, pp. 150–165, has a useful collection of rabbinic references to separatist groups and to their practices.

RUSSELL (2538), pp. 155–174, in a popular work, accepts the identification of the Qumran sect with the Essenes without question.

ANDERSON (2539), pp. 194–195, accounts for the discrepancies between Josephus' and Philo's accounts of the Essenes and the Qumran texts by saying that the Essenes were a secret brotherhood and that therefore Josephus could not have known everything, and that Josephus and Philo Hellenized their accounts and omitted the most characteristically Jewish features of the sect, notably their apocalyptic side. We may comment that, as noted above, Josephus goes out of his way to state that he had personally lived with the sect; and, moreover, most of the differences between the two groups have nothing to do with Hellenization or Jewish features.

PERLMUTER (2540) agrees with GOTTSTEIN (2491) that the Qumran sect is unique.

PRYKE (2541), after considering the possible identification of the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes, Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots, Samaritans, and Karaites, postulates that the Qumran sect went through three phases: 1) priestly Zadokites; 2) apocalyptic and eschatological; 3) militarist Zealot. There is no evidence, however, in Philo, Josephus, the Talmud, or the Scrolls of such an evolution.

SIMON and BENOIT (2542), in their survey, identify the Sect with the Essenes and call the Zealots an offshoot of the Essenes. The latter statement, we must say, is rather doubtful in view of Josephus' silence on the matter and in view of the fact that Josephus praises the Essenes so highly – a thing he would hardly have done if the despised Zealots were their offshoot.

MAIER (2543), pp. 61–63, identifies the Qumran sect with the Essenes who did not marry; but we may comment that there is nothing in the Scrolls to indicate that the Covenanters distrusted women, let alone did not marry, as did the main trend of the Essenes as described by Josephus.

BROWNLEE (2543a), pp. 59–66, comparing the Essenes with the Dead Sea Sect, concludes that the differences which exist between them are not so great but merely indicate distinctions between the practice of the second century B.C.E., when the *Manual of Discipline* was written, and the first century C.E., when Josephus described the same sect. We may, however, respond that such sects tend to be extremely conservative; and it is hard to believe that such considerable changes took place within such a short time. BROWNLEE himself states that the only serious objection to the identification is on geographical grounds, since Philo restricted the Essenes to Palestine, as did Josephus apparently, whereas the Covenanters departed to Damascus prior to the time of Josephus. He follows

CHARLES' (2543aa) (p. 785) assumption, though with no supporting evidence, that the Covenanters returned to the land of Israel.

SEGERT (2543b) asserts that the Dead Sea Scrolls confirm the reports of Philo and of Josephus; but we may reply that the Sect did not believe in communism of goods.

FRITSCH (2543c), pp. 103–110, after comparing Philo, Josephus, and the Dead Sea Scrolls, concludes that the members of the Qumran sect were Essenes. Josephus, he theorizes, omits mention of the Teacher of Righteousness because the latter was the founder not of the Essenes but of a schismatic group within the Essenes. He notes, with apparent approval, the suggestion of DUPONT-SOMMER (2478) that Josephus, who admired the Essenes so greatly, purposely avoided mentioning this great leader because he had been condemned and executed by the Jews.

GÄRTNER (2543d), pp. 12–13, concludes that the Dead Sea documents accord well with Josephus' description of the Essenes' sacred meals and provide further support for the theory of their priestly origin.

I have not seen STEGEMANN (2543e) or SZÉKELY (2543f).

ROWLEY (2543g) says that the Dead Sea sectarians are Essenes but that in our various sources we see the Essenes at various stages of their development. The Sect, he says, arose in the early part of the second century B.C.E. and was then led and taught by the legitimate Zadokite high priest but separated itself when a priesthood it could not recognize as legitimate occupied the Temple, at which time it left for Damascus, eventually to return to Qumran. Josephus, he postulates, gives us outside information, the Scrolls inside information; but Josephus, we may reply, himself says that he spent some time among the Essenes; and hence it seems likely that he had some inside information.

WRIGHT (2543h) asserts that the picture of the Essenes drawn by Philo, Josephus, and others is unmistakably to be identified with the Dead Sea Sectarians, but that the differences in details cannot be ignored and that the groups cannot be regarded as a single homogeneous unit. He concludes that there is no unambiguous evidence for the existence of an independent sacrificial cult at Qumran.

CROSS (2543i) identifies the Qumran sect with the Essenes, who, he says, were a community formed and guided by a party of the ancient Zadokite priests.

DELCOR (2543j), pp. 78–79, asserts that the exercise of judicial power at Qumran by the full assembly corresponds exactly with what Josephus tells us about the Essenes (War 2. 145–146).

I am unable to read TYLOCH (2543k), who has frequent references to Josephus.

MORALDI (2543l) avers that Josephus probably did not have a direct knowledge of the Essenes, though he admired their knowledge and wisdom.

TALMON (2543m), in a popular article, notes the similarities between Josephus' account of the Essenes and the Dead Sea Sect.

MAIER and SCHUBERT (2543n), in a popular handbook on the Dead Sea Sect, present a number of the relevant texts from Josephus and others.

SANDERS (2543o), who presents a critical review of the vast literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls, summarizes (pp. 125–127) Josephus' references to the Essenes and concludes that the similarity of Josephus' description to what we have in the Scrolls, especially in the Manual of Discipline, is very impressive.

SCHIFFMAN (2543p), p. 135, says that Josephus' account of the Palestinian 'parties' was tailored to his Greek-speaking audience, that Josephus grouped many smaller sects under the term 'Essenes', that all the sects described under the heading 'Essenes' in Philo and in Josephus adhered in the main to similar Sabbath regulations, and that the Qumran sect had affinities with Pharisaic and Essene traditions, but that its separate identity must be recognized.

YADIN (2543q) notes that the Dead Sea Sect's Temple Scroll decrees that the location of public latrines was to be the northwest of the city. Josephus (War 2. 147–149) says that the Essenes went to an open place, as specified in the Pentateuch, and for this purpose fixed a place outside the camp for their latrines. Josephus' reference (War 5. 145) to the place called Bethso which leads to the gate of the Essenes is, says YADIN, to the latrine mentioned in the Temple Scroll.

BAR-ADON (2543r) presents the hypothesis that the large structure unearthed at 'En el-Ghuweir served as a meeting place for the Dead Sea Sect (cf. War 2. 129, 131) and that the presence of women is explained by War 2. 160.

ULRICHSEN (2543s) identifies the Qumran sect with the Essenes so far as the beliefs in the immortality of the soul and in the resurrection of the body (1QH 6. 29–30, 4Q 181. 1. 2. 3–6; Josephus, War 2. 154–158) are concerned.

VERMES (2543t), pp. 125–130, constantly citing Josephus, concludes that the Dead Sea Sect cannot be the Pharisees, Sadducees, or Zealots, and that they must be the Essenes. He notes, however, the distressing fact that some of the material found in the caves and assigned to the international and interconfessional team twenty-four years ago has still not appeared in print and that this is likely to become the academic scandal of the twentieth century.

BUITKAMP (2543u) notes the differences between the Essenes as described by Josephus and the Dead Sea Sect, and concludes that Josephus lacks much that the Qumran documents fill in.

ROSENBERG (2543v) comments on the connection between the concept of *zedek* in the Scrolls with the Essene view that the heavenly *Zedek* would become incarnate.

SHARVIT (2543w) emphasizes the differences between the Qumran sect and the Pharisees in that the former stressed ethics and the latter study.

SHARVIT (2543x) notes that Josephus does not stress the importance of wisdom among the Essenes, and warns against deducing that the Essenes derived their view of the supremacy of wisdom from Greek sources, since Josephus does not mention any Greek influence upon them.

GINZBERG (2543y) often refers to Josephus in his discussion of the Halakhah of the Zadokite sect. He argues (pp. 332–334) that the precepts in the Zadokite document dealing with the Sabbath are not only in complete agreement with Pharisaic Halakhah but even have, in some cases, a pronounced anti-Sadducean spirit. He notes that the Essenes' care to wash themselves after defecation (War 2. 149) is a Pharisaic precept. Hence, he concludes, the Essenes were 'hyper-

Pharisees'. We may comment that the Essenes apparently did know and observe the Oral Torah; otherwise, surely, Josephus, a Pharisee, would not have expressed such admiration for them. But they were hyper-Pharisaic only in certain observances; in the disdain for marriage which marked the main stream of the Essene movement they departed from a basic Pharisaic precept.

GOWAN (2543z), pp. 211–236, concludes that the balance of probability at present points toward the identification of the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes; in any case, the Sect is an Essene-like group.

SHARVIT (2543za) remarks that it is difficult to perceive whether the strictness of the sect was characteristic of only the sect or whether this was the standard for all Jews and was only later alleviated by the rabbis. The strictness of the Essenes (whom he identifies with the Sect) in the observance of the Sabbath (War 2. 147) should be understood, he says, in the light of their long struggle against the Hellenizers; the observance of the Sabbath differentiated the so-called 'Semi-proselytes' to Judaism – the 'G-d-fearers' – from the 'full' Jews, and its observance was closely related to the coming redemption of the Jews.

LICHT (2543zb) concludes that the Qumran sect closely resembles the Essenes but is not fully identical with them. Like the Essenes, the Qumran sect strongly believed in determinism.

SHARVIT (2543zc) cites Josephus uncritically on the importance of the position of priests both among the Essenes and the Dead Sea Sect. We may, however, comment that Josephus was, after all, a priest – and a proud one at that – and may thus have been prejudiced.

COPPENS (2543zd), commenting on the relation of the Qumran sect to the two groups of Essenes – those who marry and those who do not –, stresses that the Qumran scrolls have no statement about celibacy.

MAIER (2543ze) frequently cites Josephus, particularly as to the practices of the Essenes as compared with those of the Sect as described in the Temple Scroll.

MILGROM (2543zf) notes that, according to Josephus (Ant. 3. 261–262) and the Mishnah (Niddah 7. 4), those contaminated by a corpse required isolation; but, according to the Temple Scroll, this is not necessary, and instead ablutions are required on the first day, which permit those contaminated to remain in the city.

STARCKY (2543zg), assuming the identity of the Qumran sect with the Essenes, says that the Teacher of Righteousness was the contemporary, at least at the end of his life, of Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II.

THIERING (2543zh) says that the historical period that best fits the Teacher of Righteousness is that after 63 B.C.E. She reconstructs the history of the Qumran community, noting the correspondence with events in the history of the Roman occupation of Palestine.

## 22.30: The Relationship of the Essenes to the Christians

(2544) THOMAS DE QUINCEY: *The Essenes*. In: *Historical and Critical Essays*. Vol. 1. Boston 1853. Pp. 29–118.

- (2545) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Essenes and Messianic Expectations: A Historical Study of the Sects and Ideas During the Second Jewish Commonwealth. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 45, 1954–55, pp. 83–119.
- (2546) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Travesty on Scholarship. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 47, 1956–57, pp. 1–36.
- (2547) JACOB L. TEICHER: The Essenes. In: *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 63 (= *Studia Patristica*, 1). Berlin 1957. Pp. 540–545.
- (2548) HANS BARDTKE: Die Handschriftenfunde am Toten Meere. Vol. 2: Die Sekte von Qumrân. Berlin 1958.
- (2549) OTTO BETZ: Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament. In: *Revue de Qumran* 1, 1958–59, pp. 213–234.
- (2550) ANGELO PENNA: Il reclutamento nell'essenismo e nell'antico monachesimo cristiano. In: *Revue de Qumran* 1, 1958–59, pp. 345–364.
- (2551) HANS KOSMALA: Hebräer-Essener-Christen. Studien zur Vorgeschichte der frühchristlichen Verkündigung (*Studia Post-Biblica*, 1). Leiden 1959.
- (2552) JOHANNES P. M. VAN DER PLOEG: Six années d'études sur les textes du Désert de Juda: Aperçu analytique et critique. In: *La Secte de Qumrân et les origines du Christianisme* (*Recherches Bibliques*, 4). Brussels and Paris 1959. Pp. 11–84.
- (2553) HENRI SÉROUYA: Les Esséniens. Paris 1959.
- (2554) NORMAN GOLB: The Qumran Covenanters and the Later Jewish Sects. In: *Journal of Religion* 41, 1961, pp. 38–50.
- (2555) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Esséniens, zélotes et sicaires et leur mention par paronymie dans le Nouveau Testament. In: *Numen* 13, 1966, pp. 88–115.
- (2556) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Une mention des Esséniens dans un texte syriaque de l'Apocalypse. In: *Le Muséon* 79, 1966, pp. 155–164.
- (2557) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Les Esséniens et 'Ceux qui sont dans les maisons des rois' (Matthieu, 11, 7–8 et Luc 7, 24–25). In: *Revue de Qumrah* 6, 1967–69, pp. 261–277.
- (2558) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: La mention des Esséniens dans le texte grec de l'épître de S. Jude. In: *Le Muséon* 81, 1968, pp. 503–521.
- (2559) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: 'Faux Prophètes': surnom des Esséniens dans le Sermon sur la Montagne. In: *Revue de Qumran* 7, 1969–70, pp. 45–79.
- (2559a) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Une mention paulinienne des Esséniens de Qumrân. In: *Revue de Qumran* 5, 1964–66, pp. 553–567.
- (2559b) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Un Essénien mentionné dans les Actes de Apôtres: Barjésu. In: *Le Muséon* 84, 1971, pp. 455–476.
- (2560) MARTIN A. LARSON: The Essene Heritage or The Teacher of the Scrolls and the Gospel Christ. New York 1967.
- (2561) DAVID S. RUSSELL: The Intertestamental Period. In: *Baptist Quarterly* 22, 1967, pp. 215–224.
- (2562) EUGEN WERBER: Christianity Before Christ? (in Serbian). Zagreb 1972.
- (2562a) CHARLES F. POTTER: The Lost Years of Jesus. New Hyde Park, New York 1963.
- (2562b) JOHANNES LEHMANN: Jesus-Report. Protokoll einer Verfälschung. Düsseldorf-Wien 1970. Trans. into English by MICHAEL HERON: Rabbi J. New York 1971.
- (2562c) JEAN DANIELLOU: Philon d'Alexandrie. Paris 1958.

The famous essayist DE QUINCEY (2544), basing himself on Josephus, argues that the Essenes were actually Christians. He suggests that Josephus, whom he attacks as an unreliable historian with depravity of taste, intended obliquely to discredit some of the chief Christian doctrines by representing them as having been anticipated by the Essenes. We may comment that if the 'Testimonium Flavianum', which is highly favorable to Christianity, is genuine, such a theory is



highly unlikely; and even if the text is not genuine or interpolated, there is no indication that Josephus sought to attack the Christians.

In answer to the question why the Essenes are not mentioned in the Tannaitic literature or in the Gospels, ZEITLIN (2545) replies that they were individualists and did not participate in the affairs of the Jewish people religiously or politically; but if so, we may reply, one would expect them to be mentioned in the Talmud, if only to be denounced.

ZEITLIN (2546) remarks that Josephus and Hippolytus, in their accounts of the Essenes, avoid the theological term 'baptism', since the Christian Hippolytus, at least, knew that the Essenes' ablutions had nothing in common with Christian baptism. We may, however, comment that the same verb, ἐβαπτίσατο, is used in the Septuagint in connection with Naaman (II Kings 5. 14), who "dipped himself" seven times in the Jordan; and there is no indication that it there has anything in common with what is distinctive to Christian baptism.

TEICHER (2547) presents the thoroughly fantastic hypothesis that both the Essenes and the Sectaries are Christians and that the Essenes persecuted by the Romans (War 2. 152-153) cannot refer to Jews.

BARDTKE (2548), pp. 321-333, in a popular work, conjectures that it is probable that the Sectaries, after the destruction of their community, were absorbed by Jewish Christians. There is, we may note, no evidence in the Jewish or Christian sources to support such a theory, though, if it were true, one would have expected Christian sources especially, who would have been proud of the 'conversion' of such an important and distinctive group, to mention this.

BETZ (2549), who assumes the identification of the Qumranites with the Essenes, regards Christianity as a fulfillment of Essenism.

PENNA (2550) traces back the monastic movement to the Essenes; but, we may comment, if this were so, we would have to account for the gap of more than two centuries between the presumed end of the Essenes in 70 and the beginnings of monasticism, and similarly for the fact that monasticism arose in Egypt rather than in Palestine.

KOSMALA (2551), pp. 118-121, notes the similarity in theological vocabulary between the Essenes' teaching concerning the immortality of the soul (War 2. 158) and that in the Epistle to the Hebrews. Since, we may comment, Josephus is generally little interested in such theological matters, the correspondence is the more remarkable. But KOSMALA goes too far in suggesting that the people to whom the Epistle is addressed were Essenes, since none of the truly distinctive features of the life-style of that group are indicated in the Epistle.

VAN DER PLOEG (2552) presents a valuable critical survey of the scholarly literature on the question of the connection of Qumran with the origins of Christianity.

SÉROUYA (2553) concludes that though to some degree the influence of the Essenes on Christianity may be seen in Christianity, there is little or no similarity between Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness.

GOLB (2554) stresses, though unconvincingly, the parallels between the Essenes as described in Josephus, the Mandaeans (the early quasi-Judaeo-Christian Gnostic sect), and the later Karaites.

DANIEL (2555) argues that the Zealots, Sicarii, and Essenes are not mentioned directly in the Gospels because all three were secret societies, and hence dangerous in the eyes of the authorities. He notes that the Essenes are similarly not mentioned in the Dead Sea Scrolls or in the Talmud. He sees an allusion to the Essenes in the thorns (ἀκανθῶν) mentioned in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 7. 16) which he equates with Hebrew *seneb* (thornbush), hence Essenes. The equation of *seneb* and Essenes is, to say the least, far-fetched; and if, as DANIEL further indicates, the Sicarii are the fig-tree (συκῇ, i.e. σίκα) alluded to in John 1. 48, 50, would we say that the figs alluded to in the same verse in Matthew (7. 16) are the Sicarii? But this would identify Jesus with the Sicarii, since the figs are favorably contrasted with the thistles.

DANIEL (2556) finds a reference to the Essenes in a Syriac text of the Book of Revelation which speaks of *hazoiai*, “prophets”. We may remark, however, that the reference, which is to the impure and the sorcerers and all the prophets and those who affirm lies, is much too general to be decisive.

DANIEL (2557) finds a reference to the Essenes in the passage (Matthew 11. 7–8 and Luke 7. 24–25) which speaks of those in the wilderness who are in kings’ houses; but the reference is much too general, and the allusion to kings’ houses is probably not to be taken literally but figuratively as part of Jesus’ well-known regal imagery.

DANIEL (2558) identifies as Essenes those who were engaged in dream speculations (ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι) and from there proceeded to immoral conduct (Jude 8). He cites Josephus’ references to Simon the Essene’s (War 2. 111–114 and Ant. 17. 345–348) interpretation of the dream of Archelaus. He sees a further reference to the Essenes in the mention in Jude 16 of flatterers (presumably a reference to their political ties with the house of Herod). We may reply that the passages in Jude are much too general to warrant this identification.

DANIEL (2559) identifies the ‘false prophets’ mentioned in Matthew 7. 15 as the Essenes, who included prophets among their members (War 2. 159), rather than as the Zealots, who did not become a group until after 60 (War 2. 258–260). But the term ‘false prophets’ is a very broad one, we must reply, and hardly applicable to the Essenes alone. It could just as easily apply to the false prophets mentioned in War 2. 258–260 or to individual false prophets mentioned in various places in his works.

DANIEL (2559a) notes that οἱ πολλοί (2 Cor. 2. 17) is the same phrase employed by Josephus for the mass of the members of the Essenes, and that there is another significant parallel in the importance of angelology for both the Christians (Colossians 2. 18) and the Essenes (War 2. 142).

DANIEL (2559b) argues, on the basis of Josephus, that the Essenes were on good terms with the Romans, the protectors and patrons of Herod and of the princes of his family (since they were close to Herod), and that the violent hostility of the Zealots to the Essenes could have existed only if the latter were not adversaries of the Romans. He suggests that Bar Jesus (Acts 13. 6) was an Essene, since he was a protégé of a high Roman dignitary, that his name may be derived from the Aramaic *bar hezwa* (“visionary”) and that the name of Elymas (Acts 13. 8), who is termed a sorcerer, may be derived from the Hebrew *hālema*?

(“dreamer”, “interpreter of dreams”), both of which would then recall the self-designation of the Qumran sectaries as seers and the etymology of Essenes from *hōzēh* (“seer”). We may comment, however, that all of these etymologies are problematical and that to bring them together is consequently unwarranted. The pages of Josephus reveal numerous prophets and sorcerers during this period; and to identify them as Essenes simply because they were on good terms with the Romans at a time when many, if not most, of the Pharisaic leaders were similarly opposed to the revolutionaries is extravagant.

LARSON (2560), in a highly controversial and basically unreliable book, identifies the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes (after uncritically noting a few similarities between the Sect and the Essenes and without bothering to cite differences), and terms John and Jesus Essenes who broke their vows of secrecy.

RUSSELL (2561) plausibly concludes that the writers of the New Testament drew from a common reservoir of terminology and ideas which were well known to the Essenes, as well as to other Jewish groups of the time.

I have not seen WERBER (2562).

POTTER (2562a), pp. 33–36, in a popular presentation which cites Josephus uncritically, identifies the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes and contends that Christianity arose from Essenism.

LEHMANN (2562b), pp. 37–49 (English translation, pp. 35–44), in a popular romanticized account of the life of Jesus, stresses the parallels between Jesus and the Essenes as described by Josephus.

DANIÉLOU (2562c) notes similarities between the Essenes and the early Christians.

## 22.31: The Zealots: General

(2563) KAUFMANN KOHLER: Zealots. In: *Jewish Encyclopaedia* 12, 1906, pp. 639–643.

(2564) OSCAR CULLMANN: Who Were the Zealots? In his: *Jesus und die Revolutionäre seiner Zeit*. Gottesdienst, Gesellschaft, Politik. Tübingen 1970. Pp. 73–82. Trans. into English by GARETH PUTNAM: *Jesus and the Revolutionaries*. New York 1970. Trans. into French: *Jésus et les révolutionnaires de son temps*. Culte, Société, Politique. Paris 1970. Trans. into Swedish by STIG LINDHAGEN: *Jesus och hans tids revolutionärer*. Stockholm 1970. Trans. into Italian by GUIDO STELLA: *Gesù e i rivoluzionari del suo tempo*. Culto, società, politica. Brescia 1971. Trans. into Spanish by ELOY REQUENA: *Jesus y los revolucionarios de su tiempo*. Culto, sociedad, politico. Madrid 1971. Trans. into Japanese by KAWAMURA TERUNORI: Tokyo 1972. Trans. into Portuguese by CÂCIO GOMES: *Jesus e os revolucionários de seu tempo; culto, sociedade, política*. Petrópolis, Brasil 1972.

(2565) SAMUEL ANGUS: Zealots. In: JAMES HASTINGS, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* 12, 1921, pp. 849–855.

(2566) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: John of Gischala and Simon bar Giora (in Hebrew). In: *Institute of Jewish Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, ed., Studies in Memory of Asher Gulak and Shmuel Klein*. Jerusalem 1942. Pp. 153–170. Rpt. from his: *When a Nation Fights for Its Freedom*. Tel-Aviv 1936. Pp. 295–330. Trans. into French by SAMUEL NISSENBAUM: *Quand une nation lutte pour sa liberté; essais d'histoire juive*. Le Caire 1940.

- (2567) BO REICKE: De judiska aktivisterna och det romersk-judisk kriget 66–73 e. kr. In: Svenska Jerusalem Föreningens Tidskrift 45, 1946, pp. 81–91.
- (2568) SALO W. BARON: Social and Religious History of the Jews. 2nd ed. Vol. 2. New York 1952. Trans into French: Paris 1956.
- (2569) MARTIN HENGEL: Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr. (= Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums, 1). Leiden 1961; rev. ed. 1976.
- (2570) BØRGE SALOMONSEN: Nogle synspukter fra den nyere debat omkring zeloterne (in Danish = Some Opinions Derived from Recent Debate Concerning the Zealots). In: Dansk Teologisk Tidsskrift 27, 1964, pp. 149–162.
- (2571) CECIL ROTH: The Zealots – a Jewish Religious Sect. In: Judaism 8, 1959, pp. 33–40.
- (2572) ALAN L. PONN: The Relationship between Josephus' View of Judaism and His Conception of Political and Military Power. Rabbinical thesis, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, Ohio, 1961.
- (2573) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: The Zealots, the Jewish Resistance against Rome, A.D. 6–73. In: History Today 15, 1965, pp. 632–641. Rpt. in his: Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men, and Events. New York 1969. Pp. 282–297.
- (2574) B. CELADA: Partidos político-religiosos y cristianismo naciente. Sicarios y zelotas. In: Cultura Biblica (Segovia, Spain) 23, 1967, pp. 94–103.
- (2575) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: Storia d'Israele. 4th ed., Torino 1947. Trans. into French by PAUL AURAY: Histoire d'Israël. 2 vols. Paris 1939. Trans. into English by CLEMENT DELLA PENTA and RICHARD T. A. MURPHY: The History of Israel. 2 vols. Milwaukee 1955. Trans. into German by KONSTANZ FASCHIAN: Geschichte Israels. Wien 1954. Trans. into Polish: Dzieje Izraela. Warsaw 1956. Trans. into Spanish: Historia de Israel. Barcelona 1945.
- (2576) KLAUS WEGENAST: Zeloten. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 9A.2, 1967, cols. 2474–2499.
- (2577) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: Die Zeloten – ihre geschichtliche und religionspolitische Bedeutung. In: Bibel und Liturgie 41, 1968, pp. 2–25. Trans. into English (abridged): The Significance of the Zealots. In: Theology Digest 17, 1969, pp. 241–246.
- (2578) H. PAUL KINGDON: The Origins of the Zealots. In: New Testament Studies 19, 1972–73, pp. 74–81.
- (2579) PIERRE PRIGENT: Préhistoire d'une guerre religieuse. In: Bible et Terre Sainte 118, 1970, pp. 2–3.
- (2580) MORTON SMITH: Zealots and Sicarii, Their Origins and Relation. In: Harvard Theological Review 64, 1971, pp. 1–19.
- (2581) DAVID M. RHOADS: Some Jewish Revolutionaries in Palestine from 6 A.D. to 73 A.D. according to Josephus. Diss., Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 1973.
- (2582) MARTIN HENGEL: Zeloten und Sikarier: Zur Frage nach der Einheit und Vielfalt der jüdischen Befreiungsbewegung 6–74 nach Christus. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 175–196.
- (2583) HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE: The Presentation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1975. Published as: The Interpretation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Missoula, Montana 1976.
- (2583a) BUNZO AIZAWA: Neshin tō o meguru nisan no mondai (Problems on the Zealots) (in Japanese). In: Hirosakidaigaku jinmon shakai (Humanism and Society, Hirosaki University), no. 2, 1951, pp. 45–58.
- (2583b) FERDINAND HAHN: Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum (based on diss., Heidelberg: Anfänge christologischer Traditionen). Göttingen 1963. Trans. (somewhat abridged) into English by HAROLD KNIGHT and GEORGE

OGG: *The Titles of Jesus in Christology; their history in early Christianity*. London 1969.

- (2583c) WILLIAM R. FARMER: *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*. New York 1956, 1963.
- (2583d) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *New Testament History*. London 1969; New York 1971.
- (2583e) J.-ALFRED MORIN: *Les deux derniers des Douze. Simon le Zélote et Judas Iskariôth*. In: *Revue Biblique* 80, 1973, pp. 332–358.
- (2583f) ISRAEL LEE LEVINE: *The Zealots at the End of the Second Temple Period as a Historiographical Problem (in Hebrew)*. In: *Cathedra* 1, 1976, pp. 39–60.

Among the outstanding older treatments may be mentioned KOHLER (2563), recently revised by CULLMANN (2564), as well as ANGUS (2565).

KLAUSNER's (2566) sympathies, for nationalistic reasons, are entirely with the Zealots, whom he calls enthusiastic patriots and the communists of the time; but, we may remark, there is no indication in Josephus that they believed in or practiced communism of property.

I have not seen REICKE (2567).

BARON (2568), pp. 46–48, has a brief, impartial analysis of the Zealots from the social and economic point of view, with good bibliographical notes.

The most important work on the subject is by HENGEL (2569), who has assiduously collected and carefully, and on the whole objectively, analyzed all the references to the Zealots, and who has investigated the various terms (notably *λησταί*, Sicarii, Biryonî, Galilaeans) used to describe the diverse revolutionary parties, though his interpretation of them as part of an eschatological movement in late Judaism may well be questioned. It is seemingly plausible for HENGEL to suggest that Josephus suppressed the eschatological aspect of the Zealots, as he did the messianic aspect of the great war against the Romans generally, because the Romans would regard it as seditious; but, on the other hand, we may wonder why Josephus, who hated the Zealots to such a degree, should have sought to suppress anything that would discredit them. HENGEL's view of the term Zealots as embracing more or less all the revolutionary groups is questionable in view of the fact that Josephus himself (War 7. 259–274) specifically differentiates the Zealots from the Sicarii and other groups. HENGEL rightly calls Josephus' picture of the Zealots fragmentary and tendentious. He underestimates, however, the economic and political factors and loses perspective by ending his treatment with the fall of Masada in 74. Finally, his thesis that Jesus repudiated the Zealots remains unproven.

In his second edition HENGEL removes misprints and errors, adds new references to sources and new bibliographical information, introduces some minor changes and supplements, and adds an appendix on critical reaction to the first edition.

SALOMONSEN (2570) has an extended critique, with full bibliographical notes, of HENGEL in which he argues that there was no tie between the circle of Jesus and Qumran and none between the Pharisees and the Zealots. The Zealots, he says, following Josephus, were probably a small group; and he regards the identification of the Zealots with *Kannaim* in rabbinic writings as questionable, though, we may comment, the fact that the name *Kannaim* is used inter-

changeably with the name *Sicarii* in *Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan* (version A, chapter 6, sub finem; version B, chapter 7, ed. SCHECHTER, p. 20) would argue for a relationship to the Zealots. SALOMONSEN follows Josephus in regarding the Zealots as a patriotic resistance movement rather than as a party with a religious ideology; we may ask why, if they had a religious ideology, Josephus would have suppressed this, and we may remark that in the one passage (*War* 7. 259–274) where Josephus digresses to give a systematic presentation of the five revolutionary groups, he compares them primarily in their political activities but does comment on the religious practices of the group led by John of Gischala; hence we may assume that if there were significant differences in the religious attitudes of the other groups Josephus would have noted them.

ROTH (2571) argues that in first-century Judaism any political attitude had to have a religious basis; and, indeed, as Josephus himself says, this religious basis was the view that it was a cardinal sin to acknowledge alien sovereignty as, for example, by paying poll taxes to the government. If we are correct in regarding the term ‘Fourth Philosophy’ as an ‘umbrella’ group embracing the various revolutionary factions, the sole difference between them and the Pharisees, at least according to Josephus (*Ant.* 18. 23), was that they were willing to accept G-d alone as their leader. In an answer to the question as to how terrorists can be religious, ROTH points to parallels in the seventeenth-century English Civil War and in the Jewish terrorist groups of 1946–48 that preceded the creation of the State of Israel.

PONN (2572) contends that Josephus in his treatment of the Zealots, as well as in his account of the decline of the earlier Hasmonean kingdom, is following an identical pattern of expressing in religious terms what he had conceived of in political terms from personal observation. We may comment, however, that his description of the Zealots is primarily in political and military terms, the sole religious aspect being that they accepted the sovereignty only of G-d.

BRANDON (2573), in a popular article, says that Josephus, inspired by personal embarrassment, gives a distorted picture of the Zealots which, until the more critical appraisal of recent years, had been generally accepted as the truth. He notes that Josephus only begrudgingly gives them the name ‘Zealots’.

CELADA (2574), dependent primarily on Josephus, surveys the Zealots and the *Sicarii*, whom he distinguishes. He comments particularly on RICCIOTTI (2575).

WEGENAST (2576), in a thorough and critical account, which is largely a summary of HENGEL (2264), differentiates among the “robbers” (*λησται*), *Sicarii*, and Zealots. He sees no similarity between the Christians and the Zealots, but follows Josephus (*War* 1. 648–649, 2. 517–518, *Ant.* 18. 23–24) in concluding that there were ties between the Pharisees and the Zealots. We may comment that Josephus apparently uses the term *λησται* as a generic term for brigands, since, for example, he speaks (*War* 4. 504) of the brigands (*ληστές*, definitely the *Sicarii*, *War* 4. 399–400) who had seized Masada.

BAUMBACH (2577) says that Josephus is very partisan on the issue of the revolution and must consequently be used with great caution. He describes the Zealots as an eschatologically oriented priestly party, ready to resort to violence

in their zeal for the purity of the Temple; but, we may comment, there is nothing in Josephus or in any other contemporary source to indicate that they were a priestly party or that they were more concerned for the purity of the Temple than other pious Jews or that they were eschatologically oriented.

KINGDON (2578), examining the use of the term *ζηλος* in the Septuagint and Josephus, concludes that Josephus restricts its use to those who occupied the inner Temple as their stronghold (War 4. 51) and that it is doubtful whether they can rightly be thought of as a circumscribed political party. He finds that many Jews referred to by Josephus as *λησταί* or Sicarii or Zealots were, in fact, motivated by similar factors.

PRIGENT (2579) has a brief popular sketch of the Zealot movement.

SMITH (2580) contends that the Zealots in War 2. 651 refer to individual Zealots.

RHOADS (2581) attempts to discern from a close analysis of Josephus' clearly prejudiced account the social, political, and religious aspects of the various revolutionary factions described in Josephus' catalogue (War 7. 259–274) – the Sicarii, the followers of John of Gischala, the followers of Simon bar Giora, the Idumaeans, and the Zealots. He notes that, despite Josephus, they represent a geographical cross-section of Palestine and suggest widespread, spontaneous, if disorganized, support of the war. He concludes that there is no evidence of a revolutionary sect at Qumran or in the New Testament and that the Zealots mentioned in the Mishnah are private individuals rather than a party.

HENGEL (2582) contests the conclusions of SMITH (2580) by examining the usage of *ζηλωτής*.

ATTRIDGE (2583) suggests that there is a continuity between Josephus' critique of the Zealots in the 'War' and the emphasis on retributive justice in the 'Antiquities'.

I am unable to read AIZAWA (2583a).

HAHN (2583b), pp. 154–156, asserts that Josephus' account of the Zealots is certainly not fair and that they doubtless had connecting links with the Hasmoneans. This is the thesis of FARMER (2583c); and we may comment that inasmuch as Josephus was descended from the Hasmoneans he might well have chosen to erase the connection with the Zealots, whom he hated. And yet, we may remark that the Hasmoneans sought both religious and political liberty, whereas the all-consuming goal of the Zealots was political independence. Again, the Hasmoneans lacked the eschatological drive of the Zealots.

BRUCE (2583d), pp. 88–95, has a general survey of the Zealots.

MORIN (2583e) agrees with SMITH (2580) in differentiating the Zealots from the Sicarii, since Josephus does not call the Fourth Philosophy Zealots. He surveys the history of the Zealots, utilizing only those documents that refer to them explicitly.

LEVINE (2583f) notes the negative treatment of the Zealots in nineteenth-century Christian and Jewish historiography because of theological considerations and cites a shift in attitude in the twentieth century, especially during the past twenty years, the new view being based upon a critical approach to Josephus. The rise of Zionism, he correctly asserts, has changed much of Jewish

opinion on the Zealots. He pleads that scholars should not assign blame or praise to the deeds of the revolutionaries.

### 22.32: The Name and Origin of the Zealots

- (2584) ALBRECHT STUMPF: ζήλος. In: GERHARD KITTEL, ed., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 2. Stuttgart 1935. Pp. 879–890. English trans. by GEOFFREY W. BROMILEY: *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1964. Pp. 877–888.
- (2585) KARL H. RENGSTORF: λησιτής. In: GERHARD KITTEL and GERHARD FRIEDRICH, edd., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 4. Stuttgart 1942. Pp. 262–267. Trans. into English by GEOFFREY W. BROMILEY: *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids 1967. Pp. 257–262.
- (2586) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Letter. In: *Judaism* 8, 1959, pp. 177–178.
- (2587) CECIL ROTH: The Zealots – a Jewish Religious Sect. In: *Judaism* 8, 1959, pp. 33–40.
- (2588) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Letter. In: *Judaism* 8, 1959, pp. 277–278.
- (2589) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Letter: Zealots in the *Jewish War*. In: *Judaism* 9, 1960, p. 81.
- (2590) ISIAH KITOWSKY: Letter. In: *Judaism* 8, 1959, p. 371.
- (2591) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Josephus and the Zealots: A Rejoinder. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 5, 1960, p. 388.
- (2592) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Recent Literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Socratic Irony. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 51, 1960–61, pp. 254–261.
- (2593) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: History, Historians, and the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 55, 1964–65, pp. 97–116.
- (2594) CECIL ROTH: New Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: *Commentary* 37, June 1964, pp. 27–32.
- (2595) GODFREY R. DRIVER: The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution. Oxford 1965.
- (2596) MARC BORG: The Currency of the Term ‘Zealot’. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 22, 1971, pp. 504–512.
- (2597) BØRGE SALOMONSEN: Some Remarks on the Zealots with Special Regard to the Term ‘Qannaim’ in Rabbinic Literature. In: *New Testament Studies* 12, 1965–66, pp. 164–176.
- (2598) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Esséniens, zélotes et sicaires et leur mention par paronymie dans le Nouveau Testament. In: *Numen* 13, 1966, pp. 88–115.
- (2599) CONSTANTIN DANIEL: Les Esséniens et ‘Ceux qui sont dans les maisons des rois’ (Matthieu 11, 7–8 et Luc 7, 24–25). In: *Revue de Qumran* 6, 1967–69, pp. 261–277.
- (2600) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: Die Zeloten – ihre geschichtliche und religionspolitische Bedeutung. In: *Bibel und Liturgie* 41, 1968, pp. 2–25. Trans into English (abridged): The Significance of the Zealots. In: *Theology Digest* 17, 1969, pp. 241–246.
- (2601) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Trial of Jesus of Nazareth*. London 1968.
- (2602) JOHN M. ALLEGRO: *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East*. Garden City, New York 1970.
- (2603) H. PAUL KINGDON: Who Were the Zealots and Their Leaders in A.D. 66? In: *New Testament Studies* 17, 1970–71, pp. 68–72.
- (2604) FREDERICK J. FOAKES-JACKSON and KIRSOPP LAKE: *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Vol. 1. London 1920.
- (2605) JOSEPH NEDAVA: Who Were the Biryoni? In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 63, 1972–73, pp. 317–322.



(2605a) MENAHEM STERN: *Sicarii and Zealots*, In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 263–301, 374–377.

STUMPF (2584) has a survey of the use of the terms ζήλος, ζηλόω, and ζηλωτής in intertestamental literature, but has disappointingly little analysis of the usage in Josephus. He concludes that it is almost certain that the Zealots had their source in Pharisaism.

RENGSTORF (2585), pp. 263–264, is particularly concerned with Josephus' use of ληστής.

ZEITLIN (2586) attacks ROTH (2587) for confusing the Zealots and the Sicarii and notes that the name Zealot for a sect is first mentioned in War 2. 651. In a rejoinder ROTH asserts that Josephus uses the term Zealot at least twice before War 2. 651, namely 2. 444 and 2. 564.

In his reply ZEITLIN (2588) convincingly notes that Josephus never uses the word Zealot in the 'Antiquities' as a name of a sect but often uses it as an adjective. In his reply ROTH remarks that he has consulted the most eminent authorities at Oxford and that they agree that in War 2. 444 the word 'Zealot' is used as a noun. We agree that this is so, but the meaning is merely "fanatics", and hardly necessarily refers to the party of the Zealots.

ZEITLIN (2589), in reply to KITOWSKY (2590), asserts that generally Josephus uses the term 'Zealot' in the connotation of "imitation", "spirit". It is in this sense that Josephus uses the term in War 2. 564.

ZEITLIN (2591) notes that the word "zealot" occurs fifty times in the 'War' and in each instance is rendered by *zelotas* in the Latin translation, and that when Josephus uses ζηλωτής in War 2. 444 the Latin renders it by the adjective *studiosos*, "zealous", "devoted", "fanatic", or in 2. 564 by the adjective *affectantem*, "by disposition".

ZEITLIN (2592) reiterates that Josephus mentions the Zealots for the first time when he speaks of the establishment of the provisional government and for the last time in the account of the capture of Jerusalem.

ZEITLIN (2593), in a critique of ROTH (2594), repeats that Josephus did not use the term Zealots in the 'Antiquities' because that work concludes with the events preceding the outbreak of the revolt before the Zealots had come into existence, whereas the term Sicarii is found in Antiquities 20. 186, 204, and 208, since they had come into being in 6 C.E.

DRIVER (2595), p. 245, contends that the fact that Jesus' disciple Simon is termed τὸν καλούμενον ζηλωτὴν ("the so-called zealot", Luke 6. 15) and again ὁ ζηλωτής ("the zealot", Acts 1. 13), as well as ὁ Καναναῖος (Matthew 10. 4, Mark 3. 18), possibly from the Hebrew word for zealot, *kanna'i*, puts back the origin of the group by a quarter if not a half century (unless the writers of the New Testament are guilty of an anachronism). BORG (2596) replies that the term need mean no more than "the zealous one" and does not necessarily refer to a party. We may comment that in the Talmud (Sanhedrin 82b) Phinehas is termed "a zealot, the son of a zealot", i.e., the term may refer to individual zealous people. The term, we may add, is apparently like Hasid ("pious") in that it may

be used under certain circumstances to indicate adherence to a party, or it may be used as a common noun as well.

SALOMONSEN (2597) concludes that the term *Qannaim* (*Kannaim*) in rabbinic literature is not the equivalent of ζηλωταί, that the *Qannaim* were private persons acting in behalf of the community, and that one should speak not of one party, since it may have had heterogeneous elements and thus have been a resistance movement without any specific religious ideology. This would explain why there are no Zealot writings. To the degree that they were a heterogeneous group, we may add, the Zealots were like the Pharisees and Essenes, in all probability. But as to the lack of Zealot writings because the movement lacked a specific religious ideology, we may note that there are no Essene writings, unless the Dead Sea Sect be identified as Essenes, and then we would have to recall that it was not until 1947 that these were discovered. Admittedly, in first-century Palestine, it is hard to believe that there could be a movement that attracted such devotion as did the Zealots without a religious orientation. Finally, we may suggest that the reason why the Talmud does not mention the Zealots as a party is because it calls them by a different name, Biryonim (Giṭṭin 56a).

DANIEL (2598) finds a hidden reference to the Zealots in Matthew 11. 7 and 12. 20, where the word κάλαμος, "reed", may be a translation of *kaneh*, which in sound is similar to *kanna'i*, "zealot"; but, we may comment, there is nothing in the context to give a hint that Zealots are referred to. Elsewhere, we may note, DANIEL (2599) sees a hidden reference not to the Zealots but to the Essenes in the passage in Matthew 11. 7–8 which speaks of those who are in the houses of kings and in the desert.

BAUMBACH (2600) dispenses with the connection in doctrine between the Zealots and the Pharisees, declaring that this is merely a non-historical invention of Josephus. We may reply, however, by asking why Josephus, who despised the Zealots, would have connected them with his beloved Pharisees if they were not, in fact, connected.

BRANDON (2601), pp. 31–34, remarks that Josephus shows a curious reluctance to use the name Zealots (= *Kannaim*), since *Kannaim* is an honorable epithet in Hebrew. If we ask why he does so in the 'War' but not in the 'Antiquities', the reason would be that of ZEITLIN, that the Zealots were not organized until after the war had started.

ALLEGRO (2602), pp. 179–184, in a work showing more imagination than scholarship, derives the Hebrew *Kannaim* from the Sumerian mushroom title *Gan-na-im-a-an*. He places the first-century Zealots in the same category of mushroom-worshippers and users of the powerful drug obtained therefrom as the frantic Maenads and the Christians, who were similarly the object of persecution by upholders of law and order. It is superfluous to comment that there is no basis in either Josephus or the Talmud, neither favorably disposed toward the Zealots, for this theory that the Zealots were drug-maddened lunatics.

KINGDON (2603) takes issues with FOAKES-JACKSON and LAKE (2604), p. 243, who state that Josephus' first use of the term Zealots occurs in War 4. 161 (read 160), where he applies it to John of Gischala's followers, and that he

applies it to no others. KINGDON notes that the name is found as early as 2. 444, 564, and 651, long before John had become prominent in the resistance to Rome. The first two of these passages, as we have remarked above, refer, in all probability, not to the Zealots but to zealous people. Josephus, he notes, distinguishes the Zealots from the followers of John a number of times. KINGDON states that this question is decided by War 5. 250, which refers to Eleazar ben Simon as the old commander still in charge of the Zealots, who had laid aside their quarrel with John.

FOAKES-JACKSON and LAKE (2604), p. 420, note that the name 'Zealot' is arrogated to themselves by John of Gischala and his followers (War 4. 161), who came to Jerusalem, started a popular movement against the high priestly families, and succeeded in procuring the election of the obscure Phinehas as high priest (War 4. 155). We may suggest that this may explain the origin of the term 'Zealots', since Phinehas in the Torah (Numbers 25. 11) is called a zealot.

BORG (2596) also finds the first reference to the Zealots in War 2. 444 to designate the followers of Menahem in 66 C.E., and says that for the period prior to the war Josephus uses the pejorative term *λησται* to describe the liberation front. Since, he says, the term 'Zealot' is an exceedingly opprobrious one, there is no good reason why Josephus should have failed to use it in describing the brigands from 6 C.E. on, unless the term was not, in fact, in use during that period. We may comment that the term 'Zealot', which is found in the Bible in connection with Phinehas, is a very complimentary one, and this may be the reason why Josephus hesitated to apply it to the party. When he does, he grudgingly grants it to them, speaking of them as 'so-called' Zealots (*τῶ τῶν ζηλωτῶν κληθέντων γένος*, War 7. 268), or saying that (War 4. 161) "for so they (the Zealots) called themselves, as though they were zealous in the cause of virtue and not for vice". The clear implication is that they do not deserve such an honorable epithet.

NEDAVA (2605), noting that the Talmudic word *Biryoni* means palace-soldiers, castle-guards, or keepers, suggests that it may refer to a political party affiliated in some way with the Zealots and deriving its name from their dedication to the defense of the fortress of Jerusalem against the Romans. Inasmuch as they were organized at a time when the defense of Jerusalem was not yet hopeless, they may be, adds NADAVA, precursors of the Sicarii. We may remark that the fact that the Talmud (*Giṭṭin* 56a) mentions Abba Sikra (literally "father of the dagger-men", presumably the Sicarii) as the head of the Biryoni supports the connection with the Sicarii.

STERN (2605a) notes that Josephus refers to the Zealots as a distinct group only after the victory over Cestius Gallus in 66 C.E., but contends that their existence antedates this. In particular, they are to be associated with the refusal to sacrifice for the welfare of the emperor, which, according to the Talmud (*Giṭṭin* 56a), was due to the initiative of Zechariah ben Avkilus, who is probably to be identified with Zacharias the son of Amphicalleus (War 4. 225), a colleague of Eleazar ben Simon, the chief of the Zealots.

**22.33: The Relationship of the Maccabees to the Zealots**

- (2606) WILLIAM R. FARMER: *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*. New York 1956, 1963.
- (2607) WILLIAM R. FARMER: *An Inquiry into the Relationship between Jewish Nationalism of the Second Century B.C. and That of the First Century A.D. with Special Reference to the Writings of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., Union Theological Seminary, New York 1952.
- (2608) ISAAC M. JOST: *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Sekten*. 3 vols. Leipzig 1857–59.
- (2609) JOSEPH BONSIRVEN: *Le Judaïsme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ. Sa théologie*. 2 vols. Paris 1934–35; abridged ed., 1950.
- (2610) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus. Second Commonwealth Parallelisms*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49, 1958–59, pp. 75–80.
- (2611) WILLIAM R. FARMER: *The Palm Branches in John 12, 13*. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 3, 1952, pp. 62–66.
- (2612) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: *Das Freiheitsverständnis in der zelotischen Bewegung*. In: FRITZ MAASS, ed., *Das ferne und das nahe Wort: Festschrift Leonhard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres* (Beihefte, Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 105). Berlin 1967. Pp. 11–18.
- (2613) MARCEL SIMON and ANDRÉ BENOIT: *Le Judaïsme et le christianisme antique d'Antiochus Épiphane à Constantin* (Nouvelle Clío, 10). Paris 1968.
- (2614) MATTHEW BLACK: *Judas of Galilee and Josephus's 'Fourth Philosophy'*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Tübingen 1974. Pp. 45–54.
- (2614a) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY: *La Secte des Zélotes. Résumé* in: *École pratique des Hautes Études, 4<sup>e</sup> Section, Sciences historiques et philologiques, Annuaire 1969–70*. Pp. 131–149.

FARMER (2606), in a work which retains much of the repetitious style of his doctoral dissertation (2607), argues that the Zealots who revolted against the Romans in 66 were the spiritual descendants of the Maccabees of two centuries earlier and that Josephus deliberately obscured this connection because he was himself descended from the Hasmoneans, who had been allies of Rome and hence could praise them, whereas he felt bitterly against the Zealots. The theory is not new, having been suggested already by JOST (2608), vol. 1, pp. 327–328, and BONSIRVEN (2609). Such a thesis, of course, we may remark, is contrary to Josephus, who draws a sharp line of distinction between them, bitterly condemning the former and praising the latter. While, we admit, the Zealots may well have been inspired by the Maccabees, FARMER fails to note that whereas the Maccabees revolted because of the suppression of the Jewish religion, the Jews of the time of the Zealots had religious liberty and revolted in order to obtain political liberty, which, to be sure, they saw in religious terms. Again, if most scholars are to be believed, the Zealots had a consuming drive to hasten the coming of the Kingdom of G-d, which the Maccabees lacked. HOENIG (2610), moreover, rightly objects that FARMER's conclusion that the Zealots must be heirs of the Maccabees because they loved the Temple, abstained from eating swine flesh, and observed the Sabbath and circumcision is to ignore the fact that such zeal is characteristic of pious Jews in that and in every other age. As to FARMER's argument that the leaders of the Zealots bore names identical with

those of the early Maccabees, HOENIG correctly notes that the names – Matathias, Judas, John, Eleazar, Jonathan, and Simon – are common in the Talmud also. We may suggest that the Zealots may be related to the Maccabees if, as some scholars postulate, the latter derived from the Hasidim, who were supposedly the progenitors of the Pharisees, whose theological position the revolutionary groups shared except for their belief that G-d alone was their king.

FARMER (2611) suggests that the use of palm branches on coins links the Maccabees and the Jewish rebels of 66 and 132. We may note, however, that the palm is a widespread symbol, hardly restricted to rebel groups, but found also on many tombstones and coins to symbolize victory in general, for example of the Jew against his accusers (cf. Leviticus Rabbah 30. 2).

BAUMBACH (2612) offers further objections to FARMER's theory, noting that the Romans did not forbid the practice of the Jewish religion, whereas Antiochus did. If, indeed, the Zealots were directly connected with the Maccabees, we may ask why the Talmudic rabbis, who were deeply disappointed in both, did not link them.

SIMON and BENOIT (2613) rightly caution against pushing too far the parallel between the Zealots and the Maccabees, since very different circumstances led to the two revolts and since Judaism, after all, was a *religio licita* under the Romans. They suggest that the truth is to be found somewhere between the partisan evidence of Josephus, who blackened the Zealots, and the modern exegeses, who were insufficiently critical of the sect and too critical of Josephus.

BLACK (2614) supports FARMER's thesis regarding the Zealots as a neo-Maccabean movement. He notes that the descendants of Ezekias provided the leaders of the Jewish resistance in the century that followed Herod's conquest of Palestine; we may comment, however, that there is no evidence of their being linked to the Maccabees, nor is there anything to indicate that they were of royal station.

NIKIPROWETZKY (2614 a) notes the link between the Maccabees and the Zealots in belief, though it is impossible to establish a lineal connection.

## 22.34: The Views of the Zealots

- (2615) CECIL ROTH: Melekh ha-'olam: Zealot Influence in the Liturgy? In: Journal of Jewish Studies 11, 1960, pp. 173–175.
- (2616) WILLIAM L. LANE: Times of Refreshment: A Study of Eschatological Periodization in Judaism and Christianity. Diss., Th.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1962.
- (2617) LLOYD GASTON: No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels. Leiden 1970 (= Novum Testamentum, Supplement 23).
- (2618) MARTIN HENGEL: Die Zeloten. Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr. Leiden 1961.
- (2618a) OTTO BETZ: Stadt und Gegenstadt: Ein Kapitel zelotischer Theologie. In: B. BINZING, O. BÖCHER, and G. MAYER, edd., Wort und Wirklichkeit: Studien zur Afrikanistik und Orientalistik, Teil 1: Geschichte und Religionswissenschaft – Bibliographie. Meisenheim am Glan 1976. Pp. 96–109.

ROTH (2615) suggests that the insertion of the 'sovereignty' passages into the New Year Day liturgy is connected with the revolutionary triumph in the autumn of 66 during the New Year period. There is, we may respond, no actual evidence to support such a conjecture; indeed, in view of the opposition of Johanan ben Zakkai and apparently most other rabbis to the revolutionaries such a tribute to them seems unlikely.

LANE (2616) says that despite the fact that Josephus records nothing that would lead us to suspect that the Zealots had messianic pretensions, rabbinic literature has such a tradition; but, we may reply, the passage which he cites (Midrash Shir ha-shirim 2. 7. 1) does not mention the Zealots by name; and the two leaders whom he identifies as Zealots, Eleazar ben Dinai (War 2. 235, 2. 253, Ant. 20. 121, 20. 161) and Amram, are identified as Zealots neither in Josephus nor in the Talmud.

GASTON (2617), pp. 440–444, agrees with HENGEL (2618) that the Essene and Zealot prophets were of a historical-political character and identifies the oracle (War 6. 311–313) that someone from Judaea would become ruler of the world as the one which led the Zealots to hope for the eschatological fulfillment; but, we may comment, there is no evidence in any of our extant sources that the Zealots were eschatologically minded and that they were led to their revolt by any oracles. Josephus says merely (War 4. 388) that they did not disbelieve (οὐκ ἀπιστήσαντες) the prediction that Jerusalem would be captured and the Temple burnt whenever there would be civil war and the Temple defiled by Jews.

I have not seen BETZ (2618a).

## 22.35: The Relationship of the Zealots to the Essenes and to the Dead Sea Sect

- (2619) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: History of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). 5 vols. Jerusalem 1949; 3rd ed., 1952.
- (2620) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: The Beginning and End of the Heroes of Masada (in Hebrew). In his: When a Nation Fights for Its Freedom. Tel-Aviv 1936. Pp. 125–152 (8th ed., 1952, pp. 189–214). Trans. into French by SAMUEL NISSENBAUM: Quand une nation lutte pour sa liberté; essais d'histoire juive. Le Caire 1940.
- (2621) WILLIAM BURSTEIN: The Tragic End of the Masada Warriors (in Yiddish). In: Die Zukunft 75, April 1970, pp. 176–180.
- (2622) CECIL ROTH: Le point de vue de l'historien sur les Manuscrits de la Mer Morte. In: Evidences, vol. 9, no. 65, June-July 1957, pp. 37–43.
- (2623) CECIL ROTH: The Jewish Revolt against the Romans (66–73) in the Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: Palestine Exploration Quarterly 90, 1958, pp. 104–121.
- (2624) CECIL ROTH: The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford 1958. Trans. into Hebrew by DANIEL SHER. Tel-Aviv 1958.
- (2625) CECIL ROTH: The Zealots and Qumran: The Basic Issue. In: Revue de Qumran 2, 1959–60, pp. 81–84.
- (2626) JEAN CARMIGNAC, rev.: CECIL ROTH, The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: Revue de Qumran 1, 1958–59, pp. 443–447.
- (2627) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: Qumran, the Essenes, and the Zealots. In: Beihefte, Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft (= Festschrift Otto Eissfeldt) 77, 1958, pp. 184–192.

- (2628) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: The Qumran Sectaries and the Zealots. An Examination of a Recent Theory. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 9, 1959, pp. 379–392.
- (2629) CECIL ROTH: New Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: *Commentary* 37, June 1964, pp. 27–32.
- (2630) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: The Significance of the Zealots. In: *Theology Digest* 17, 1969, pp. 241–246.
- (2631) ABRAHAM N. POLIAK: The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Approach. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49, 1958–59, pp. 89–107.
- (2631a) HENRI E. DEL MEDICO: Deux manuscrits hébreux de la Mer Morte. Essai de traduction du 'Manuel de Discipline' et du 'Commentaire d'Habbakuk' avec notes et commentaires. Paris 1951.
- (2631b) ANNIE JAUBERT: Jésus et le Calendrier de Qumrân. In: *New Testament Studies* 7, 1960–61, pp. 1–30.
- (2631c) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY: La Secte des Zélotes. Résumé in: *École pratique des Hautes Études*, 4<sup>e</sup> Section, Sciences historiques et philologiques, *Annuaire* 1969–70, pp. 131–149.
- (2631d) GEZA VERMES: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Qumran in Perspective*. London 1977; Cleveland 1978.

In the third edition of his history, KLAUSNER (2619) adds an appendix on the Dead Sea Scrolls in which for the first time the suggestion is made that the sectaries were Zealots.

Elsewhere KLAUSNER (2620), followed by BURSTEIN (2621), views the Zealots as activist Pharisees and the Sicarii as activist Essenes. They regard the Sicarii as Zealots of a special kind who were driven by Essenism into shifting the focus of their concept of freedom from a political to a social one. They suggest that Josephus, in the speeches which he has put into the mouth of Eleazar ben Jair at Masada, has fused Zealot (they mean Sicarii) and Essene ideas, and that the common denominator of these ideas is their adamant hatred of subjugation to any oppressor and their capacity to withstand physical torture. But, we may comment, just before Eleazar's speech, Josephus (War 7. 262–274) clearly distinguishes among the various extremist groups which he roundly condemns, and does not include the Essenes, whom he elsewhere praises in high terms (War 2. 119–161). KLAUSNER says that Eleazar ben Jair's views on life and death and immortality are those of the Essenes, but we may suggest that a likelier explanation is to view them as Greek ideas placed by Josephus into the mouth of Eleazar in accordance with the liberty claimed by ancient historians in speeches of their characters.

This view, identifying the Dead Sea Sect with the Zealots, was adopted by ROTH (2622), who notes the following points of similarity: 1) both venerated the memory of a Teacher (of Righteousness) who was 2) killed by a (Wicked) Priest 3) on or near the Day of Atonement with 4) a follower named Absalom. ROTH (2623) identifies the Teacher of Righteousness with the revolutionary leader Menahem ben Joseph or with his nephew and successor Eleazar ben Jair, both of whom are prominent in the 'War'. In the light of the Scrolls, ROTH dogmatically proceeds to supplement and correct Josephus' account of the revolt against the Romans; John of Gischala is identified with the Scrolls' "Lion of Wrath" and Phanni ben Samuel with the Scrolls' "Last Priest". We may comment that there is no evidence, despite ROTH, that Menahem ben Judah was a high priest.

The key fact that the sect at Qumran and Masada used a different calendar from that accepted by other Jews would, we would say, militate against ROTH's identification of them with the revolutionaries, since, according to Josephus, these revolutionaries agreed with the Pharisees in all respects except in their refusal to accept any human kingship. In view of the extreme importance of the calendar in Jewish life, it would seem hard to believe that Josephus would have made such a statement when their calendar also differed from that of other Jews.

These views of ROTH are repeated in a short book (2624). Despite skillful attempts (2625) to defend his thesis, notably against CARMIGNAC (2626), he has found few supporters. He has been most successfully refuted by ROWLEY (2627) (2628), who upholds the identification with the Essenes. ROTH (2629), who regards the Sicarii as the extreme wing of the Zealots, jumped with joy when YADIN discovered at Masada fragments of a scroll containing the same calendar as that used at Qumran; since Josephus tells us that the group at Masada were Sicarii, he claimed proof that the group at Qumran were likewise. YADIN's discovery certainly called in question SANDMEL's observation that ROTH's observation "wins by a length" the race for the most preposterous of the theories about the Scrolls.

BAUMBACH (2630) comments that the War Scroll found at Qumran contains so many Zealot features that it is tempting to identify the Sectaries as Zealots rather than as Essenes; and he theorizes, though with no evidence, that the Essenes split into the Zealot and a pacifist group. This hypothesis, he says, will explain why the name Zealot first appears in Josephus at the outbreak of the 'War', why Josephus never calls the followers of Judas the Galilaean Zealots, why the older Qumran texts contain few Zealot features, and why Zealots were so strongly opposed to the Sadducees.

POLIAK (2631) supports ZEITLIN's theory of the medieval origin of the Scrolls because he finds it hard to believe that Josephus could have omitted mention of them in his narrative about the Zealots and Sicarii, since they were so much closer to Jerusalem than Masada and provided a much better base for operations in the Jerusalem area. We may remark that there were probably a number of such groups, and, in a work that is not primarily theological, Josephus contented himself with depicting at some length a typical type of ascetic sect. In any case, Josephus was interested in the Zealots and Sicarii as political and military movements primarily.

DEL MEDICO (2631a) concludes that the events to which the Dead Sea 'Commentary on Habakkuk' alludes took place in 66, that the Teacher of Righteousness is Menahem (War 2. 433–448), and that the members of the Qumran sect can be identified with the Zealots.

JAUBERT (2631b) suggests that the Zealots were perhaps a branch of the Essenes.

NIKIPROWETZKY (2631c), assuming the identification of the Essenes and the Dead Sea Sect, accepts the connection between the Essenes and the Zealots on the basis of the violent anti-Roman remarks in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

VERMES (2631d), pp. 122–125, noting that the evidence about the Zealots in Josephus is tendentious, concludes that the Dead Sea Sect cannot be the



Zealots, inasmuch as the Qumran establishment was occupied from about 140 B.C.E., while the Zealot party did not come into being until 6 C.E. He identifies the Sect's Wicked Priest with Jonathan the Hasmonean, the furious young lion with Alexander Jannaeus, and the land of Damascus with Qumran. As to Josephus' silence concerning the Teacher of Righteousness, VERMES compares Josephus' silence concerning Hillel and Johanan ben Zakkai.

### 22.36: The Relationship of the Zealots to Jesus and to Early Christianity

- (2632) OSCAR CULLMANN: *Der Staat im Neuen Testament*. Tübingen 1956; 2nd ed., 1961. Trans. into English: *The State in the New Testament*. New York 1956; rev. ed., London 1963.
- (2633) OSCAR CULLMANN: *Jesus und die Revolutionäre seiner Zeit*. Gottesdienst, Gesellschaft, Politik. Tübingen 1970. Trans. into English by GARETH PUTNAM: *Jesus and the Revolutionaries*. New York 1970. Trans. into French: *Jésus et les révolutionnaires de son temps*. Culte, Société, Politique. Paris 1970. Trans. into Swedish by STIG LINDHAGEN: *Jesus och hans tids revolutionärer*. Stockholm 1970. Trans. into Italian by GUIDO STELLA: *Gesù e i rivoluzionari del suo tempo*. Culto, società, politica. Brescia 1971. Trans. into Spanish by ELOY REQUENA: *Jesus y los revolucionarios de su tiempo*. Culto, sociedad, político. Madrid 1971. Trans. into Japanese by KAWAMURA TERUNORI: Tokyo 1972. Trans. into Portuguese by CÂCIO GOMES: *Jesus e os revolucionários de seu tempo*; culto, sociedade, política. Petrópolis, Brasil 1972.
- (2634) ROBERT EISLER: *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (2635) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church. A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity*. London 1951; 2nd ed., 1957.
- (2636) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Jesus and the Zealots*. In: *Annual of the Leeds Univ. Oriental Society* 2, Leiden 1959–61, pp. 11–25.
- (2637) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity*. Manchester 1967. Trans. into French by G. and B. FORMENTELLI: *Jésus et les Zélots. Recherches sur le facteur politique dans le christianisme primitif*. Paris 1975.
- (2638) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Jesus and the Zealots*. In: *Studia Evangelica*, ed. FRANK L. CROSS, 4, 1968, pp. 8–20.
- (2639) WILLIAM KLASSEN: *Jesus and the Zealot Option*. In: *Canadian Journal of Theology* 16, 1970, pp. 12–21.
- (2640) MARTIN HENGEL: *War Jesus Revolutionär?* (Calwer Hefte zur Förderung biblischen Glaubens und christlichen Lebens, no. 110). Stuttgart 1970. Trans. into English by WILLIAM KLASSEN: *Was Jesus a Revolutionist?* (Facet Books, Biblical Series, no. 28). Philadelphia 1971.
- (2640a) T. A. BURKILL: *The Trial of Jesus*. In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 12, 1958, pp. 1–18.
- (2640b) FERDINAND HAHN: *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum*. Göttingen 1963 (based on diss., Heidelberg: *Anfänge christologischer Traditionen*). Trans. into English (somewhat abridged) by HAROLD KNIGHT and GEORGE OGG: *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: their history in early Christianity*. London 1969.
- (2640c) OSCAR CULLMANN: *Die Bedeutung der Zelotenbewegung für das Neue Testament*. In: OSCAR CULLMANN, *Vorträge und Aufsätze, 1925–1962*, ed. KARLFRIED FRÖHLICH. Tübingen–Zürich 1966. Pp. 292–302.

- (2640d) FAUSTO PARENTE: Escatologia e politica nel tardo giudaismo e nel Cristianesimo primitivo. In: *Rivista Storica Italiana* 80, 1968, pp. 234–296.
- (2640e) CLEMENS THOMA: Leben-Jesu-Forschung im Sog des Journalismus. Aphoristische Bemerkungen zu neuen Jesubüchern. In: *Bibel und Liturgie* 41, 1968, pp. 26–32.
- (2640f) WALTER WINK: Jesus and Revolution: Reflections on S. G. F. Brandon's *Jesus and the Zealots*. In: *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 25, 1969, pp. 37–59.
- (2640g) WILLIAM R. WILSON: *The Execution of Jesus: A Judicial, Literary and Historical Investigation*. New York 1970.
- (2640h) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: *Jesus von Nazareth im Lichte der jüdischen Gruppenbildung*. Berlin 1971.
- (2640i) GEORGES CRESPEY: Recherche sur la signification politique de la mort du Christ. In: *Lumière et Vie* 20.101, 1971, pp. 89–109.
- (2640j) JOACHIM GNILKA: War Jesus Revolutionär? In: *Bibel und Leben* 12, 1971, pp. 67–78.
- (2640k) JACQUES GUILLET: Jesus et la Politique. In: *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 59, 1971, pp. 531–544.
- (2640l) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: Die Stellung Jesu im Judentum seiner Zeit. In: *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 20, 1973, pp. 285–305.
- (2640m) JOHN GWYN GRIFFITHS: Zealot and para-Zealot. In: *New Testament Studies* 19, 1973, pp. 483–486.
- (2640n) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: Jesus and the Zealots: A Correction. In: *New Testament Studies* 17, 1971, p. 453.
- (2640o) J.-ALFRED MORIN: Les deux derniers des Douze: Simon de Zélote et Judas Iskariôth. In: *Revue Biblique* 80, 1973, pp. 332–358.
- (2640p) HANS-RUEDI WEBER: Libérateur ou Prince de la Paix? In: *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 48, 1973, pp. 317–349.
- (2640q) H. M. KUITERT: Was Jesus een revolutionair? In: *Rondom het Woord* 12.3, 1971, pp. 305–320.
- (2640r) GEORGE R. EDWARDS: *Jesus and the Politics of Violence*. New York 1972.
- (2640s) HUGH J. SCHONFIELD: *The Jesus Party*. New York 1974.
- (2640t) MICHEL GOURGUES: Jésus et la violence. In: *Science et Esprit* 31, 1979, pp. 125–146.

CULLMANN (2632), pp. 5–11 (English version, pp. 8–23), ([2633], pp. 3–82), says that it is an exaggeration for EISLER (2634) to make Jesus himself into a Zealot, but that it is also an error to underestimate the importance of the Zealots for the doctrines and life-style of Jesus and of primitive Christianity. Above all, he concludes, we must understand that Jesus was put to death by the Romans as a Zealot, as the inscription on the cross, “Jesus of Nazareth, king of the Jews”, indicates. We may comment that though Jesus was put to death as a revolutionary, there is no evidence that he was specifically a Zealot; and if Josephus’ use of the term ‘Zealots’ is to be trusted, the group did not come into being until a generation after Jesus’ death. The ‘Testimonium Flavianum’, if it is genuine, would, of course, refute any connection between Jesus and the Zealots, because Josephus so despised the Zealots, whereas the passage speaks favorably of Jesus; if the passage is interpolated, Christians would certainly have avoided linking Jesus with the Jewish nationalists.

BRANDON (2635), who also looks upon Jesus as a political Messiah in the tradition of EISLER, avoids, nevertheless, recourse to the Slavonic Josephus to support his position. He suggests that the silence about the fate of the Jerusalem church in early Christian tradition is probably due to the fact that many Jewish Christians made common cause with their countrymen in the struggle against

Rome. If so, we may comment, one would expect reference to this in the remarks about the early Christians in the works antagonistic to them, but there are no such statements. On the contrary, we find statements in Christian writings that the fall of the Temple is Divine punishment for the Jewish negation of Jesus' claims.

BRANDON (2636) correctly suggests that hostility to EISLER's view implicating Jesus in the Jewish national cause against Rome was due partly to EISLER's theory about the Slavonic Josephus and partly to the prevailing feeling about revolution at the time that he wrote the book. To maintain, he says, that Jesus refrained from becoming involved in his people's aspiration for freedom from the Roman yoke is to say that he was unpatriotic and indifferent to his countrymen's struggle against the injustice of their foreign oppressors. We may recall, however, that not only Josephus but also the majority of the Pharisaic leaders, to judge from Josephus and the Talmud, were opposed to the revolution.

BRANDON (2637) continues to attempt to portray Jesus and the early Jewish Christians as Zealot sympathizers. Though Jesus' main target was the priestly aristocracy, he was recognized as a political messiah by the masses, but the evangelists, he contends, modified their portrayal of Jesus because of the change in the political situation after his death. BRANDON adduces as support the fact that one of Jesus' followers was Simon the Zealot; but, as noted above, this may mean simply "one who is zealous", and the term 'Essene' applied to the general John the Essene in Josephus may mean that at one time he was a member of such a group. He also notes that at the Roman trial of Jesus, his fate was linked with that of Barabbas, who seems to have led a recent resurrection against the Romans (Mark 15. 7), that Jesus was crucified between two λησται, that the surname of his follower Judas Iscariot may indicate that he was a member of the Sicarii, and that he urges his disciples (Luke 22. 36) to sell their cloaks and to buy swords. On this last point we may comment that even the pacifistic Essenes took along weapons on their trips because of robbers (War 2. 125) and that Rabbi Eliezer permitted carrying weapons on the Sabbath for the same reason, as a matter of course (Mishnah, Shabbath 6. 4). BRANDON attaches importance to Jesus' silence about the Zealots, but such an *argumentum ex silentio*, always dangerous, is particularly so in this case since, as we have argued above, it is quite possible, even probable, that the term Zealots had not yet come into vogue in Jesus' lifetime.

BRANDON (2638) presents a summary of his thesis.

KLASSEN (2639), while admitting that Jesus was influenced by the Zealot movement, disputes BRANDON (2637) and argues that Jesus differs in fundamental matters, notably in his powerlessness and in his life among sinners.

HENGEL (2640) concludes that Jesus' ethical system was revolutionary but that his political actions were not; and he suggests that the revolutionists are reading their own views back into Jesus. One of HENGEL's most telling arguments is that during the forty years between Jesus' death and the Neronian persecution, the Roman government took no additional action against the Christians in Palestine.

BURKILL (2640a) remarks that leading revolutionaries of the tetrarchial period, as we may gather from Josephus, were accustomed to lay claim to royal dignity, and that from this we may reasonably infer that they were often fired with an intense religious enthusiasm, imagining that they were actually the anointed of G-d or divinely commissioned for the sacred task of finally delivering their people from the yoke of their Gentile oppressors. Hence it may be that Mark 15. 26 originally signified that Jesus was sentenced to death by the procurator on a political charge. Josephus naturally wished to present Judaism in a favorable light to the Romans; therefore, says BURKILL, some allowance should be made for his tendency to minimize the importance of the religious factor in Jewish revolutionary movements of the first century C.E.

HAHN (2640b), pp. 161–162, arguing that the Slavonic text is unreliable, refutes EISLER (2634), who had tried, on the basis of that text, to prove that Jesus himself had given occasion for a Zealot movement.

CULLMANN (2640c) concludes that Jesus, throughout his entire activity, disputed with the Zealots, though he also was not uncritical of the Roman state, and that he was crucified by the Romans as a Zealot.

PARENTE (2640d) discusses Josephus' presentation of political messianism, the Zealot movement, and the high priesthood in Josephus. He concludes that the attitudes of the sects and of Jesus must be viewed from both a political and an eschatological point of view.

THOMA (2640e) comments on BRANDON (2637), in particular, charging that he has falsified the picture of Jesus, in that he has cast doubt upon the reliability of the Gospels while giving undue credibility to Josephus.

WINK (2640f) refutes the contention of BRANDON (2637) that Jesus was sympathetic toward and worked in collaboration with the Zealot movement.

WILSON (2640g), pp. 85–93, in a popular account, which notes, in particular, the struggle of the procurators against the Zealots, stresses Jesus' connections with the revolutionary movement.

BAUMBACH (2640h), after a survey of the Jewish religious parties, especially on the basis of Josephus, opposes the view of BRANDON (2637) and argues that Jesus does not stand close to the Zealot movement. He says that neither John the Baptist nor Jesus was influenced greatly by Essenism via Qumran but that Jesus was closer to the Pharisees.

CRESPI (2640i) says that though it is true that some of Jesus' disciples were Zealots and that some of his own teaching was understood as Zealotism by his disciples, yet Jesus was much more radical than the Zealots in that he was not content merely to seek liberation from the Romans but rather foresaw a radical transformation of the world to be begun by his own death.

GNILKA (2640j), pp. 68–73, making uncritical use of Josephus, discusses the Zealot movement and Jesus' attitude toward the Zealots. He concludes that Jesus was a revolutionary in the sense that he wanted a fundamental change in every person but that he shunned violence in effecting his goals.

GUILLET (2640k), though admitting that Jesus provoked the politicians, concludes that the connections of Jesus and the Zealots rest on a questionable basis, namely the identification of the Sicarii with the Zealots. We may, how-

ever, ask why Jesus may not have been connected with both movements at one time or another.

BAUMBACH (2640l) declines to term Jesus a messianic revolutionary or to link him with the Zealots. Jesus' condemnation to death was due to the fact that he challenged the centrality of the Temple in Judaism; and this was interpreted as an offense not only against the high priests and the Sadducees, who controlled the Temple, but also against the Romans, with whom the Sadducees were allied.

GRIFFITHS (2640m) refutes the statement of BRANDON (2640n) that Jesus was a 'para-Zealot' rather than a Zealot. The distinction, says GRIFFITHS, has little substance to it. Jesus differed basically from the Zealots in his rejection of armed resistance, though he shared with them a deep concern for the future of Israel.

MORIN (2640o) differentiates between the Zealots of the 'Jewish War' and those of the time of Jesus.

WEBER (2640p), pp. 323–326, asserts that BRANDON (2637) is guilty of *a priori* exegesis and has many questionable and even false deductions. As to KUITERT (2640q), WEBER asserts that to say that Jesus opposed the Zealots is not the same as saying that he was not a revolutionary. He is likewise critical of EDWARDS (2640r) and stresses the partiality of Josephus' evidence.

SCHONFIELD (2640s), pp. 34–42, discusses Josephus as a source for Jesus the Jewish nationalist. He suggests that it is possible that Mark's Gospel was written to make good Josephus' omission of reference to Jesus in the 'War'. We may, however, comment that the 'War' was not written until 79–81, whereas Mark is most probably earlier, being dated by most scholars as having been composed shortly after 70.

GOURGUES (2640t) surveys the extensive recent literature on the question of the connection between Jesus and the Zealots.

### 22.37: The Sicarii, the Fourth Philosophy, and the Zealots

(2641) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Fourth Philosophy (Ant. xviii. 23–25). Appendix E. In: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965. P. 564.

(2642) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: John of Gischala and Simon bar Giora (in Hebrew). In: Institute of Jewish Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, ed., Studies in Memory of Asher Gulak and Shmuel Klein. Jerusalem 1942. Pp. 153–170. Rpt. from his: When a Nation Fights for Its Freedom. Tel-Aviv 1936. Pp. 295–330. Trans. into French by SAMUEL NISSENBAUM: Quand une nation lutte pour sa liberté; essais d'histoire juive. Le Caire 1940.

(2643) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Wars of the Jews against the Romans (in Hebrew). In his: In the Days of the Second Temple: Studies in the History of the Second Temple. 3rd ed., Jerusalem 1954. Pp. 290–303.

(2644) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: History of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). Vol. 5. 4th ed., Jerusalem 1954.

- (2645) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *The Hidden Scrolls and the Wars of the Jews with the Romans* (in Hebrew). In: D. ZACCAI and ZALMAN SHAZAR, edd., *Davar Yearbook*. Tel-Aviv 1954. Pp. 286–295.
- (2646) AUGUST STROBEL: *Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f.* In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49, 1958, pp. 157–196.
- (2647) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church*. London 1951; 2nd ed., 1957.
- (2648) WILLIAM R. FARMER: *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*. New York 1956, 1963.
- (2649) CECIL ROTH: *A Solution to the Mystery of the Scrolls, Adding a Chapter to First-Century Jewish History*. In: *Commentary* 24, Oct. 1957, pp. 317–324.
- (2650) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Idolatry of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 48, 1957–58, pp. 243–278.
- (2651) CECIL ROTH: *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford 1958. Trans. into Hebrew by DANIEL SHER. Tel-Aviv 1958.
- (2652) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Recent Literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Sicarii and the Zealots*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 51, 1960–61, pp. 156–169.
- (2653) CECIL ROTH: *The Zealots in the War of 66–73*. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 4, 1959, pp. 332–355.
- (2654) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus and the Zealots: A Rejoinder*. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 5, 1960, p. 388.
- (2655) CECIL ROTH: *The Religious Nature of the Zealots*. In: MENAHEM H. KASHER, NORMAN LAMM, and LEONARD ROSENFELD, edd., *Leo Jung Jubilee Vol.* New York 1962. Pp. 203–209.
- (2656) CECIL ROTH: *Qumran and Masadah: A Final Clarification Regarding the Dead Sea Sect*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 5, 1964, pp. 81–87.
- (2657) CECIL ROTH: *New Light on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. In: *Commentary* 37, June 1964, pp. 27–32.
- (2658) CECIL ROTH: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Historical Approach*. New York 1965 (second ed. of his: *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford 1958).
- (2659) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *The Beginning and End of the Heroes of Masada* (in Hebrew). In his: *When a Nation Fights for Its Freedom*. Tel-Aviv 1936. Pp. 125–152 (8th ed., 1952, pp. 189–214). Trans. into French by SAMUEL NISSENBAUM: *Quand une nation lutte pour sa liberté; essais d'histoire juive*. Le Caire 1940.
- (2660) MARTIN HENGEL: *Die Zeloten*. Leiden 1961.
- (2661) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Zealots and Sicarii* (rev. of MARTIN HENGEL, *Die Zeloten*). In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81, 1962, pp. 395–398.
- (2662) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58, 1967–68, pp. 173–203.
- (2663) OTTO BETZ: οὐκᾰνοῖς. In: GERHARD KITTEL and GERHARD FRIEDRICH, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Vol. 7. Stuttgart 1964. Pp. 277–281. (English trans., pp. 278–282).
- (2664) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: *Zeloten und Sikarier*. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 90, 1965, pp. 727–740.
- (2665) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: *The Significance of the Zealots*. In: *Theology Digest* 17, 1969, pp. 241–246.
- (2666) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: *Das Freiheitsverständnis in der zelotischen Bewegung*. In: FRITZ MAASS, ed., *Das ferne und das nahe Wort: Festschrift Leonhard Rost zur Vollendung seines 70. Lebensjahres*. Berlin 1967 (= Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 105). Pp. 11–18.
- (2667) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: *Bemerkungen zum Freiheitsverständnis der zelotischen Bewegung*. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 92, 1967, pp. 257–258.
- (2668) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Zealots: The Jewish Resistance against Rome A.D.*

- 6–73. In: *History Today* 15, 1965, pp. 632–641. Rpt. in his: *Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men, and Events*. New York 1969. Pp. 282–297.
- (2669) GODFREY R. DRIVER: *The Judaean Scrolls: The Problem and a Solution*. Oxford 1965.
- (2670) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: *Qumran Fantasies: A Rejoinder to Dr. Driver's 'Mythology of Qumran'*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 63, 1972–73, pp. 247–267.
- (2671) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Sicarii and Masada*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 57, 1966–67, pp. 251–270.
- (2672) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: *The Zealots: The Case for Revaluation*. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 61, 1971, pp. 155–170.
- (2673) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: *The Sicarii in Masada – Glory or Infamy*. In: *Tradition* 11, 1970, pp. 5–30.
- (2674) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Rejoinder (in Hebrew)*. In: *Bitzaron* 62, 1970, pp. 25–29.
- (2675) MENAHEM STERN: *Zealots*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica Year Book 1973*. Jerusalem 1973. Pp. 135–152.
- (2676) MORTON SMITH: *Zealots and Sicarii, Their Origins and Relation*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 64, 1971, pp. 1–19.
- (2677) KLAUS WEGENAST: *Zeloten*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 9A.2, 1967, cols. 2474–2499.
- (2678) MARCEL SIMON and ANDRÉ BENOIT: *Le Judaïsme et le christianisme antique d'Antiochus Épiphanes à Constantin (Nouvelle Clío, 10)*. Paris 1968.
- (2679) JOHN M. ALLEGRO: *The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East*. Garden City, New York 1970.
- (2680) H. PAUL KINGDON: *Who Were the Zealots and Their Leaders in A.D. 66?* In: *New Testament Studies* 17, 1970–71, pp. 68–72.
- (2681) FREDERICK J. FOAKES-JACKSON and KIRSOPP LAKE: *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Vol. 1. London 1920.
- (2682) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Zealots*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 16, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 947–950.
- (2683) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY: *Résumé of his lectures on the Zealots, noted in ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER, Histoire ancienne de l'Orient*. In: *Annuaire 1969–70 (102<sup>e</sup> année). École pratique des Hautes Études, IV<sup>e</sup> section: Sciences historiques et philologiques*. Paris 1970. Pp. 131–149.
- (2684) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY: *La mort d'Éléazar fils de Jaïre et les courants apologétiques dans le De Bello Judaico de Flavius Josèphe*. In: ANDRÉ CAQUOT and MARC PHILONENKO, edd., *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*. Paris 1971. Pp. 461–490.
- (2685) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY: *Sicaires et Zélotes – Une Reconsidération*. In: *Semitica* 23, 1973, pp. 51–64.
- (2686) JOHANN MAIER: *Geschichte der jüdischen Religion von der Zeit Alexander des Großen bis zur Aufklärung mit einem Ausblick auf das 19./20. Jahrhundert*. Berlin 1972.
- (2687) FRANCIS X. MALINOWSKI: *Galilean Judaism in the Writings of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 1973.
- (2688) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Who Were the Galileans? New Light on Josephus' Activities in Galilee*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 64, 1973–74, pp. 189–203.
- (2689) MATTHEW BLACK: *Judas of Galilee and Josephus's 'Fourth Philosophy'*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 45–54.
- (2690) MARTIN HENGEL: *Zeloten und Sikarier: Zur Frage nach der Einheit und Vielfalt der jüdischen Befreiungsbewegung 6–74 nach Christus*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken*

- Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 175–196.
- (2690a) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: More Literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls – More Pseudo-Scholarship. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49, 1958–59, pp. 221–238.
- (2690b) DAVID M. RHOADS: The Assumption of Moses and Jewish History: 4 B.C. – A.D. 48. In: GEORGE W. E. NICKELSBURG, JR., ed., *Studies on the Testament of Moses: Seminar Papers* (Society of Biblical Literature, Pseudepigrapha Group, 1973). Missoula, Montana 1973. Pp. 53–58.
- (2690c) J. GIBLET: Un mouvement de résistance armée au temps de Jésus? In: *Revue Théologique de Louvain* 5, 1974, pp. 409–426.
- (2690d) TESSA RAJAK, rev.: E. MARY SMALLWOOD, *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden 1976. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 28, 1977, pp. 207–208.
- (2690e) PIERRE GRELOT: L'Espérance juive à l'Heure de Jésus (Collection 'Jésus et Jésus-Christ', 6). Paris 1978.
- (2690f) RICHARD A. HORSLEY: Josephus and the Bandits. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 10, 1979, pp. 37–63.
- (2690g) RICHARD A. HORSLEY: Sicarii: Ancient Jewish Terrorists. In: *Journal of Religion* 59, 1979, pp. 435–458.
- (2690h) DONALD E. GOWAN: Bridge between the Testaments: A Reappraisal of Judaism from the Exile to the Birth of Christianity (Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 14). Pittsburgh 1976.
- (2690i) MENAHEM STERN: Sicarii and Zealots. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 263–301, 374–377.

I (2641) have a short bibliography on the Fourth Philosophy, with whom the Sicarii are usually identified.

KLAUSNER (2642), asking why the Zealots fought the Sicarii, concludes that they were two different sects. Moreover, he distinguishes the Sicarii from the Talmud's 'Sikarin' (Mishnah, Makhshirin 1.6 and Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan version B, chap. 7, ed. SCHECHTER, p. 20), asserting that the latter were the group of Simon bar Giora, whom he identifies with Abba Sikra (Giṭṭin 56a). We may comment that Josephus nowhere speaks of the Zealots fighting against the Sicarii; he does differentiate (War 7. 259–274) five groups of revolutionaries, among them the Sicarii and the Zealots. Because of the similarity of the names *Sikarin* and Sicarii and because the Talmud connects the *Sikarin* with the last siege of Jerusalem, it is, we must add, most tempting to identify the groups. Similarly the name Abba Sikra, also used in the context of the Roman siege of Jerusalem, sounds very much as if it refers to the chief of the Sicarii. Inasmuch as, however, in his list of the five revolutionary groups, Josephus specifically differentiates the followers of Simon bar Giora from the Sicarii, KLAUSNER seems right in distinguishing him from the Sicarii.

KLAUSNER (2643) comments on the messianic trend of the Sicarii and of Simon bar Giora. In his monumental history of the period, KLAUSNER (2644), vol. 5, pp. 134, 228–230, contrasts the Zealots, who, he says, sought political equality and freedom from the Roman yoke, with the Sicarii, whom he calls the radical left wing of the revolutionaries, who were adherents of a communism taken over from the Essenes, and who sought social equality and a new division of property and burnt the city archives to destroy the record debts. Such a view,



we may assert, of the Sicarii depends on an unproven identification of Simon bar Giora as one of their leaders.

When the Dead Sea Scrolls were discovered, KLAUSNER (2645) triumphantly proclaimed that he had been vindicated in distinguishing the Sicarii from the Zealots; but, inasmuch as neither is mentioned in the Scrolls, the claim is hardly borne out.

STROBEL (2646), especially pp. 186–195, terms the Sicarii a strictly religious and national movement of sectarian character whom he sharply distinguishes from the Zealots. He finds in them an antipathy toward the high priests similar to that at Qumran, and hence concludes that Hippolytus is perhaps not wrong in associating the Essenes and the Sicarii. As we have noted above, however, there is no evidence in Josephus that the Sicarii were opposed to the high priests as such; rather they were opposed to collaborators, among whom the high priests were prominent.

BRANDON (2647) attempts to connect the Fourth Philosophy and the Zealots; but, as we have noted above, Josephus does not use the term Zealots as the name of a group until his description of the events of 66 C.E., whereas he mentions the Fourth Philosophy in connection with the census of Quirinius in 6 C.E.

FARMER (2648) finds a contradiction between Josephus' statement (Ant. 18. 23) that the new party agreed with the Pharisees in all respects except one, and his statement that this philosophy was one with which the Jews were previously unacquainted (Ant. 18. 9). He conjectures that in an earlier draft of the 'Antiquities' Josephus included only the statement about the sect being one with which the Jews were previously unacquainted. This would correspond to the statement in the War (2. 118) asserting that the sect had nothing in common with the others. In the new draft of the 'Antiquities' Josephus, he says, inserted the passage about the Fourth Philosophy being like the Pharisees. We may reply that it is hardly necessary to assume two drafts, since the sect may have been new and similar to the Pharisees in all respects except one. The contradiction, we may comment, is with Josephus' statement in the 'War' that the sect had nothing in common with the others; and the explanation here, we may suggest, is that in the 'War' Josephus is focussing on the political aspects, inasmuch as in the following section (War 2. 119) Josephus starts a long discussion of the philosophical (i.e. religious) aspects of the other sects.

One of the fiercest polemics in the field of Second Temple studies involved CECIL ROTH and SOLOMON ZEITLIN. ROTH (2649) asserts that the term σοφιστής applied by Josephus (War 2. 433) to Menahem (whom ROTH identifies with the Dead Sea Scrolls' Teacher of Righteousness) the son of Judah the Galilean (founder of the Fourth Philosophy, Ant. 18. 4) means "scholar" or "teacher".

ZEITLIN (2650) replies that Josephus' word for teacher is διδάσκαλος and that the term σοφιστής means an interpreter of the Bible. Inasmuch as Josephus (Ant. 18. 23, *pace* War 2. 118) declares that the Fourth Philosophy agrees with the Pharisees in all respects except that it looks to G-d alone for its master, we may assume that it agreed in focussing on study of the Torah; and this is what

their teaching would involve. Hence there is hardly much difference between σοφιστής and διδάσκαλος.

ROTH identifies the Dead Sea Sect with the Fourth Philosophy, but ZEITLIN rightly objects that if they were, in fact, identical, Josephus could hardly have said that they agree in all other respects with the Pharisees except in their refusal to accept any sovereignty except G-d's, inasmuch as the Sectararies had a solar calendar, which differed from that of the Pharisees. To judge from the Talmud, some of the bitterest disputes of the period raged with regard to the calendar; and it is hard to believe that Josephus would have passed over such a difference in silence. One must admit, however, that elsewhere (War 2. 118) Josephus declares that the Fourth Philosophy has nothing in common with the others. Moreover, in differentiating the Pharisees from the Sadducees, he makes no mention of their differences with respect to the calendar.

ROTH (2651) confuses the Zealots and the Sicarii, whereas, says ZEITLIN (2652), the Sicarii continued even after the destruction of Jerusalem, while the Zealots disappeared with the fall of the Temple; moreover, the Sicarii had a philosophy while the Zealots had none. We may comment that aside from their refusal to accept any human sovereignty the Sicarii had no philosophy.

ROTH (2653) asserts that the Zealots and the Sicarii were two wings of the same party and that ZEITLIN is incorrect in claiming that Josephus uses the term 'Zealots' for the first time in War 2. 651, since it occurs previously in War 2. 444 and 564. ZEITLIN (2654), as we have noted above, defends his assertion by noting that the Latin translation renders ζηλωτάς in War 2. 444 by *studiosos* and in War 2. 564 by *affectantem*, whereas elsewhere it transliterates the Greek word. We may comment that all that this shows is that the Latin translator agrees with ZEITLIN; but since that translator lived several centuries after Josephus it hardly proves that this was Josephus' intention.

ROTH (2655) denies that he regards the Sicarii as identical with the Zealots but insists merely that they were the extreme wing of the Zealots. He conjectures that the original devotees of the Fourth Philosophy were recruited from those (Ant. 15. 369) who refused to swear allegiance to Herod on his accession to the throne. We may reply that Josephus (Ant. 18. 4ff.) specifically dates the beginning of the Fourth Philosophy from the census of Quirinius in 6 C.E., many years later. ROTH says that it was natural enough for Josephus, writing for a Gentile audience, not to mention such minutiae as the difference between the Zealots and the Pharisees in their calendar; but we may reply that this was hardly trivial.

The fact that YADIN found at Masada the same heretical solar calendar which had been found at Qumran led ROTH (2656)(2657)(2658) in jubilation to conclude that both groups were the same, namely, Zealots (i.e. actually Sicarii); but YADIN and most other scholars who identify the Dead Sea Sect as Essenes or as a group of similar type and who thus might be tempted to cite this as support for the hypothesis of KLAUSNER (2659), made before the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, identifying the Sicarii as activist Essenes, explain the coincidence by suggesting that some members of the Dead Sea community may have taken refuge at Masada, just as we hear that John the Essene was one of the com-

manders in the war, even though the Essenes are generally thought to have been pacifistic. As we have noted above, there is actually no evidence that the Essenes would not, in fact, fight in self-defense; and the merciless torture inflicted on them by the Romans indicates that they were suspected of revolutionary associations.

HENGEL (2660) says that the Fourth Philosophy movement led by Judas the Galilaean was primarily determined by religious factors and was messianic in nature. ZEITLIN (2661), in his review-article, criticizes him for identifying the Dead Sea Sect with the Zealots and for failing to differentiate the Sicarii and the Zealots, a distinction which ZEITLIN (2662) emphasizes elsewhere as well. HENGEL says that the Zealots regarded the war against the Romans as a holy war, but ZEITLIN says that the Romans did not suppress the Judaeae religion and that the war was merely national in nature. We may reply by stating that this is precisely the distinguishing factor of the revolutionaries, that they regarded nationalism as itself a central article of religious faith. ZEITLIN insists on differentiating between the Zealots, who, he says, had no ideology and hence had no *raison d'être* for continuing after the conquest of Judaea by the Romans, and the Sicarii, who had an ideology, namely their refusal to accept the lordship of man over man. This, we may comment, depends upon identifying the Sicarii with the Fourth Philosophy, which Josephus nowhere explicitly asserts.

BETZ (2663), pp. 278–279, says that the Sicarii were united by an oath and were a volunteer group within the Zealot movement, but there is no evidence of this.

BAUMBACH (2664) contrasts the Sicarii, who, he says, arose in Galilee and sought to purify the land by circumcising or excluding the Hellenists, and the Zealots, who were founded by Saddok the Pharisee (hence their Zadokite attachment) and were devoted to the Temple worship, though he states that the Qumran sect, which he identifies with the Essenes, reflects the Messianic expectations of both the Sicarii and the Zealots. He reads War 2. 433–443 as an account of the conflict between the Sicarii led by Menahem dressed in royal robes (hence with Messianic pretensions) and the Zealots led by Eleazar. He (2665) regards as unhistorical the statement (Ant. 18. 23) that the Fourth Philosophy were like the Pharisees in all respects except their nationalism, since Josephus sought to show that the Pharisees determined Judaism after 70 and hence related everything to them.

BAUMBACH (2666) (2667) regards the idea of freedom espoused by the Sicarii as apocalyptic, in contrast to that of the Maccabees. He views Simon bar Giora and John of Gischala as leaders of the Sicarii but refuses to accept the Fourth Philosophy as a unitary movement and considers Josephus' reference to two founders of the Fourth Philosophy as reflecting a real division of the revolutionaries into two distinct groups. BAUMBACH's reconstruction, we may reply, is largely hypothetical, depending on an identification of one wing of the Fourth Philosophy with the Sicarii and of Saddok the Pharisee, one of the founders of the Fourth Philosophy, with the Zadokites, of Menahem with the Sicarii, and of Eleazar with the Zealots. As to the apocalyptic nature of the Sicarii, he does not make a systematic survey of apocalyptic literature to

examine their view of freedom, but merely cites a few illustrative passages. We may comment that in War 2. 254, shortly after mentioning the appointment of Felix as procurator of Judaea in 52 C.E., Josephus says that after he had cleared the country of brigands (λησται) another type of brigand was springing up (ἐπεφύετο), the so-called Sicarii (οἱ καλούμενοι σικάριοι): hence the Sicarii are not identical with the Fourth Philosophy, which arose in 6 C.E.

BRANDON (2668) identifies the Zealots, the Sicarii, and the Fourth Philosophy and argues that the reason why Josephus in the 'Antiquities' did not give the sect (the Fourth Philosophy) founded by Judas the Galilean a name is that he did not wish to divulge to his Gentile readers the name by which the followers of Judas were known to their fellow-Jews, namely Zealots. In reply, we may ask why Josephus in the 'War' should have mentioned the Zealots by name and should have listed them specifically among the five revolutionary parties (War 7. 259–274), whereas he avoided mentioning them in the, 'Antiquities'. The answer, we may suggest, is that the Zealots are the last of the revolutionary parties described in War 7. 259–274 and did not apparently arise until the outbreak of the war against Rome, whereas the Sicarii, as Josephus clearly says (War 7. 262), were the first of the revolutionary parties to come into being.

DRIVER (2669) says that the Sicarii and the Zealots were so closely interconnected that their eventual identification can hardly be doubted. At the beginning, he asserts, the Zealots were a more conciliatory group, which had some respect for law, whereas the Sicarii were a more extreme wing of the Zealots. DRIVER identifies Menahem with the Teacher of Righteousness and argues that Josephus would not give him the priestly title because he disapproved of him. We may reply that Josephus does give the priestly title to a number of priests of whom he disapproves. DRIVER notes that Menahem's followers are variously called Zealots (War 2. 444) or brigands (ληστρικοῦ στίφους, Life 21) and that the Sicarii are termed 'brigands' (ληστῶν, War 2. 254). We may comment that the term 'zealots' in War 2. 444 does not seem to refer to the Zealots but to fanatics in general, and that the term brigands (λησται) is used for the revolutionaries in general, as well as for robbers.

HOENIG (2670), pp. 248–252, refutes DRIVER, differentiating between the Zealots and the Sicarii in time, origin, and philosophy. DRIVER had asked why the Dead Sea Scrolls say nothing about the Zealots and Masada and had answered that the writers preferred their original name and did not want to say anything about the disaster. HOENIG's explanation for the silence is that the texts do not deal with the war of 65(66)–70. We may comment that aside from the objections to the *argumentum ex silentio*, we may explain the silence by postulating that these documents were written before the episode at Masada in 74; moreover, the documents do not mention the group by any name.

ZEITLIN (2671) stresses the differences between the Sicarii and the Zealots, arguing that the Sicarii were opposed to any government in Judaea and that they thus regarded the Zealots as traitors in that they had accepted a mortal as head of the state; but, we may comment, Josephus, who stresses the in-fighting

among the revolutionaries, ascribes no such assertion to the Sicarii. ZEITLIN says that Josephus was the first to use the term Sicarii, since he was prejudiced against them; but we may reply that the fact that the term is a Latin one, whereas Josephus' language is Greek, indicates that Josephus probably adopted it from the Romans, who, as APPLEBAUM (2672) correctly remarks, used the term as a regular word for murderers, as in the *lex Cornelia de sicariis et veneficis*, and thus may have applied it to the Jewish insurgents.

HOENIG (2673), following ZEITLIN, similarly distinguishes between the Zealots and the Sicarii and says that the Sicarii, unlike the Zealots, had an ideology and did not battle the Romans but merely undertook piratical invasions.

The Sicarii, says ZEITLIN (2674), cannot be considered devout Jews, for they were guilty of the crimes of murder and plunder, but, we may recall, many of the Jewish terrorists in the last years of the British mandate of Palestine were Orthodox Jews who similarly believed that they were doing G-d's work. To ZEITLIN (2674), however, the Sicarii were dilettantes and publicity-seekers.

If history is any guide, we may assume that the terrorist groups, while sharing a common enemy, were sharply divided in leadership and tactics. Indeed, the latest contribution to the subject, a comprehensive survey by STERN (2675), notes three major differences between the Zealots and the Sicarii: 1) the Sicarii were derived from Galilee, while the Zealots were directed by a group of priests in Jerusalem, centered their attention on the Temple, and were a Jerusalem priestly party, as SMITH (2676) and others have noted; 2) the Sicarii continued their loyalty to the dynasty of Judas the Galilaean, whereas the Zealots had no such tradition; 3) the Sicarii saw their eschatological (perhaps Messianic) hopes fulfilled in particular leaders, whereas the Zealots had no single leader whom they viewed thus.

We may suggest that the fact that the name 'Sicarii' is Latin while the name 'Zealots' is Greek in origin suggests that these are names given to groups by their opponents. STERN (2675) astutely notes that the assumption of some kind of connection among the Fourth Philosophy, the Sicarii, and the Zealots will explain the importance which Josephus attaches to the first, since he places the chief onus for the troubles which befell the Jewish people on them (Ant. 18. 9-10), whereas the Sicarii were important only at the beginning of the revolt and in the isolated episode at Masada and were not responsible for the key decision to interrupt the daily sacrifice for the welfare of the Emperor. Josephus, moreover, singles out Saddok the Pharisee (Ant. 18. 4) as one of the two chief leaders of the Fourth Philosophy; his name suggests distinct priestly associations; and this would be another point of contact with the Zealots, whose leaders were apparently priests. Perhaps, despite SMITH (2676), we may suggest that the strange term 'Fourth Philosophy' was used by Josephus precisely because he sought in the 'Antiquities' an expression that would serve to include all the terrorist organizations; hence the term is not found in his detailed listing in the 'War' (7. 259-274) of the five individual groups.

WEGENAST (2677) differentiates among λησται, Sicarii, and Zealots. He asserts that in the rabbinic passages the term Sicarii refers only to assassins of individuals but never to the name of a party. He disagrees with ZEITLIN's

distinction between the Sicarii and the Zealots on the basis of nationalism vs. religion, since at this time it is difficult to separate the two factors. He says that the identity of the Fourth Philosophy and the Sicarii is quite possible, but he rightly disagrees with ZEITLIN's view that the Sicarii and the Zealots hated each other. We may comment that the almost universal attempt on the part of scholars to equate the Fourth Philosophy and the Sicarii rests on the statement that the leader of the Sicarii at Masada was Eleazar (War 7. 253), who was a relative of the Judas (Ant. 18. 4, 23) who was one of the founders of the Fourth Philosophy. But descent, we may suggest, does not necessarily prove adherence to the very same revolutionary group. Moreover, Menahem was the son of Judas (War 2. 433), and he was a leader of the Zealots, according to those who so interpret τοὺς ζηλωτὰς in War 2. 444. We may note that in the War (2. 118) Josephus says that Judas founded a distinct sect (αἰρέσεως) but does not give it the name Fourth Philosophy, which, he says (Ant. 18. 4), this Judas founded. When he enumerates the five revolutionary groups in War 7. 259–274, he does not include Judas' sect, and we may indicate that the term Fourth Philosophy is the invention of Josephus or of others for the 'umbrella' group to include all the revolutionary groups. In view of the fact that Josephus (Ant. 18. 23) states that the Fourth Philosophy agrees with the Pharisees in all respects except that they accept G-d alone as their Master, and in view of the fact that one of their founders was Saddok the Pharisee (Ant. 18. 4), it seems more likely that the group should be regarded as activist Pharisees.

SIMON and BENOIT (2678), pp. 213–216, regard the Zealots and Sicarii as synonymous terms.

ALLEGRO (2679) connects the name Sicarii with the *saqrātiyūn*, the sacred mushroom of the modern Persians, with the name Iscariot in the New Testament, with the name Dioskouroi of classical mythology, and with the Sumerian root *Ush-gu-ri*, "knobbed bol", "phallus", which gave the name to the fungus. Hence, according to ALLEGRO, both the Zealots and the Sicarii have names derived from the words for sacred mushrooms.

KINGDON (2680) asserts, in opposition to FOAKES-JACKSON and LAKE (2681), p. 423, that Josephus, in fact, uses the term Zealots of the Jewish rebels in Jerusalem before John of Gischala came there, and that after that he applies the term to the rival party led by priests who seized the innermost buildings of the Temple.

APPLEBAUM (2672) finds it difficult to see a connection between the Zealots and the Sicarii because the former were daggersmen and transvestites (War 4. 560–563), whereas the Sicarii at Masada, at least, led an orderly family life; but we may comment that Josephus' account is clearly prejudiced, and that in any case people can be ruthless to others while they are gentle to their own family and adherents.

BRANDON (2682), comparing the two accounts of the origins of the Fourth Philosophy in War 2. 118 and Antiquities 18. 1–10, says that the latter is less objective. He says that Josephus indiscriminately used the term Sicarii for the Zealots, purposely employing an opprobrious term.

NIKIPROWETZKY (2683)(2684) concludes that the Zealots included many analogous but distinct groups and that Josephus' terminology and, in particular, his distinctions in War 7. 259–274 are inaccurate. We may, however, ask why, if, as NIKIPROWETZKY says, the name Zealots is one which the Zealots gave themselves, whereas the name Sicarii is one which the Romans gave them, Josephus specifically differentiates between the two groups in his enumeration of the five revolutionary parties (War 7. 262–274). SMITH (2676), in a pungently worded article, rightly replies that it is easier to sacrifice NIKIPROWETZKY's thesis than Josephus' statements. NIKIPROWETZKY (2685) replies to SMITH's statement that the most important text for understanding the origin of the Zealots is War 4. 129–161 by insisting that a close reading of the passage leads to the conclusion that the Jewish refugees who penetrated to Jerusalem were not qualified to be Zealots, and that Josephus writes only *ἡγοῦνται* (4. 138) and *ἀρχιῆγονται* (4. 135). He objects to SMITH's statement that the attack of the revolutionaries upon the aristocrats of Jerusalem is proof of their peasant origin, since, as he correctly notes, poverty is an ancient Jewish ideal. The weakest of SMITH's theories, he remarks, is to speak of the Zealots in Jerusalem as zealous individuals. As to the election of the high priest Phanni ben Samuel (War 4. 156–157), it is very doubtful that it was the work of the Judean peasants. Finally, he insists, interchange of the names Zealots and Sicarii in 'Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan' (version A, chapter 6, *sub finem*; version B, chapter 7, ed. SCHECHTER, p. 20) deserves more attention than SMITH gives to it; but, as we have noted, 'Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan' refers solely to the war against the Romans and not to the previous existence of the group and, secondly, does not necessarily refer to an organized group. NIKIPROWETZKY objects to SMITH's statement that the Sicarii had no popular following, and we may comment that NIKIPROWETZKY may well be right, since Josephus was clearly prejudiced against the Sicarii.

MAIER (2686), pp. 63–65, distinguishes between the Zealots, whom he regards as more political, and the Sicarii, whom he regards as more social.

HOENIG (2670) argues, against DRIVER (2669), that Josephus differentiates between the Zealots and Sicarii in tone, origin, and philosophy. As to Hippolytus' statement that the Essenes are denominated Zealots by some for threatening to slay someone if he refuses circumcision, and are termed Sicarii by others, HOENIG rightly replies that this represents two different opinions which he does not equate; the very fact, we may add, that there is a dispute on this issue supports the view that the names were not equivalent even as late as the third century, when the two groups had long since disappeared and when the distinction might have been expected to be blurred.

MALINOWSKI (2687) insists that, contrary to the common assumption identifying the Fourth Philosophy with either the Sicarii or the Zealots or both, Josephus nowhere connects Judas of Galilee, the founder of the Fourth Philosophy, with the Zealots or the Sicarii.

ZEITLIN (2688), noting that in Acts 21. 38 the Roman tribune in Jerusalem asks Paul whether he is not the Egyptian who had recently stirred up a revolt and led four thousand Sicarii (σικαρίων) out into the wilderness, remarks that

the term in Acts must have been taken over from Josephus since it is not used in Greek literature before Josephus. We may remark that it is the Roman tribune who uses the word, presumably because it is a Latin word; moreover, the term Sicarii is found in the *lex Cornelia de sicariis*, which goes back to the time of Sulla at the beginning of the first century B.C.E.

BLACK (2689), who identifies the Fourth Philosophy, the Sicarii, and the Zealots, comments on Josephus' strange silence about the outcome of Judas' rebellion.

HENGEL (2690) emphasizes the close connection of religion and politics in the revolutionary parties. He stresses the common goals of the five revolutionary groups enumerated by Josephus (War 7. 262–274) and says that they differed less in ideology than in leadership.

ZEITLIN (2690a) presents a critique of a number of books on the Dead Sea Scrolls, including that by ROTH (2658), who, he says, shows his unfamiliarity with Josephus by grouping the Sicarii, the Zealots, and the followers of John of Gischala. We may respond by saying that the very fact that Josephus speaks of the Fourth Philosophy (Ant. 18. 23), a term that he does not use at all in the 'War', even when he enumerates the five groups of revolutionaries (War 7. 262–274), is an indication that it is an inclusive term to cover all the revolutionaries.

RHOADS (2690b) says that in all probability there was not a sect called the Zealots during the early first century, and that the Zealots arose in Jerusalem in 68–70. He suggests that the idea that Judas founded the Fourth Philosophy in 6 is probably an historical anachronism on the part of Josephus, since Josephus records no revolutionary events between 6 and 48, and that when he does mention revolutionary activity in the 50's and 60's he gives no evidence of the presence of a sect. This, we may reply, is the *argumentum ex silentio*, which is dangerous: Josephus' omission may be due to the ineffectiveness of the group in its early years.

GIBLET (2690c) postulates that the Fourth Philosophy was influenced by Greek and Roman views concerning political freedom and that it was not an offshoot of Jewish apocalyptic groups. He stresses that the Zealots were pious Jews, faithful to the Temple, who were only remotely a political movement. We may comment that Josephus says nothing about Greek or Roman influence upon the Fourth Philosophy, though one may argue that perhaps he suppressed this because of his hatred for the revolutionary groups. It seems, however, unlikely that a group that was so nationalistic and so anti-Roman would have been influenced by Roman views. As to the Zealots, without doubting their piety, we must express amazement at a view that sees their political attitudes as secondary; it is precisely their insistence on political liberty that led them to their bold uprising against the Romans.

RAJAK (2690d) objects to the attempt of SMALLWOOD to account for the Judaean troubles of 6–66 by stressing the antagonism of a belligerent nationalist party to Roman taxation. She asks why, if this were so, the Persian, Ptolemaic, and even, for a time, the Seleucid rulers had apparently been acceptable. We may, however, reply that what is acceptable to one generation may not be acceptable to another. In particular, we may note that the history of the high



priesthood and of Antiochus Epiphanes awakened feelings that had previously been dormant. RAJAK further criticizes SMALLWOOD for failing to investigate the internal developments within Judaism which led to the rise of the Fourth Philosophy and of the Zealots.

GRELOT (2690e) comments on the brigands Judas the son of Ezechias (Ant. 17. 271–272) and Judas of Galilee and his clan (War 2. 118 and Ant. 18. 4–5, 23).

HORSLEY (2690f) suggests that we take seriously what Josephus says about bandits and that, contrary to HENGEL's (2690) declaration, we can discern some significant things concerning the Jewish popular resistance to the Romans from Josephus' brief comments regarding brigands. He notes that Josephus treats the Sicarii as 'bandits' only in a qualified sense, whereas he presents the Zealots as a coalition of actual bandit groups and leaders. HORSLEY emphasizes the close relationship between the brigands and the people and stresses the link between the bandits and the peasant revolt, noting the apocalyptic millenarian orientation of the bandits.

HORSLEY (2690g) insists that the Zealots, the Sicarii, and the λησται represent three separate movements. Citing frequent parallels from modern anti-colonial movements, especially in Algeria and Vietnam, he concludes that the Sicarii can best be understood as ancient Jewish 'terrorists'. Their tactics, to judge from Josephus, consisted of, first, selective symbolic assassinations; second, more general assassinations, along with destruction or plundering of the property of the wealthy and the powerful; and third, kidnapping. HORSLEY is forced to admit that Josephus, despite, we may add, his obvious prejudice against them, does not mention the Sicarii as committing other common acts of terrorist groups, such as sniping and sabotage against the army or indiscriminate attacks in public places. The Sicarii were not simply a spontaneous expression of the passion for liberty; they planned deliberately for freedom from Roman rule. Like other terrorist groups, the Sicarii did not command a very extensive following at the outbreak of the war. We may comment that this is what Josephus, who is out to discredit them, says. It is hard to believe that they could have had such initial success against the Romans unless they had very considerable popular support.

GOWAN (2690h), pp. 201–209, discusses the relationship of the Zealots and the Sicarii.

STERN (2690i) insists that, despite Josephus' partiality, it is possible to sketch the basic ideologies and activities of the various revolutionary groups both before and during the revolt.

## 22.38: The Galilaeans

(2691) SAUL LIEBERMAN: Light on the Cave Scrolls from Rabbinic Sources. In: Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research 20, 1951, pp. 395–404.

(2692) MARTIN HENGEL: Die Zeloten. Leiden 1961.

(2693) BO REICKE: Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. Die biblische Welt 500 v. – 100 n. Chr. (Sammlung Töpelmann, Reihe 2, Bd. 2). Berlin 1965. Trans. into English by DAVID

- E. GREEN: *The New Testament Era. The World of the Bible from 500 B.C. to A.D. 100*. Philadelphia 1968.
- (2694) HAROLD W. HOEHNER: *Herod Antipas*. Cambridge 1972.
- (2695) FRANCIS X. MALINOWSKI: *Galilean Judaism in the Writings of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., Duke University, Durham, North Carolina 1973.
- (2696) GEZA VERMES: *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. London 1973.
- (2697) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Who Were the Galileans? New Light on Josephus' Activities in Galilee*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 64, 1973–74, pp. 189–203.
- (2698) FRANCIS LOFTUS: *A Note on σύνταγμα τῶν Γαλιλαίων*. B.J. IV 558. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 65, 1974–75, pp. 182–183.
- (2698a) FRANCIS LOFTUS: *The Anti-Roman Revolts of the Jews and the Galileans*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 68, 1977–78, pp. 78–98.
- (2699) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.

LIEBERMAN (2691), p. 402, speaks of the Galilaeans as a group which, he says, Josephus (Ant. 18. 23) explicitly states generally followed the doctrines of the Pharisees but which, as extreme fanatics, were accounted heretical by the rabbis. We may note that Josephus here speaks of Judas the Galilaean as a founder of the Fourth Philosophy but does not speak of the Galilaeans. Moreover, there is no indication that the rabbis regarded extreme fanaticism as such as a heresy; in any case, there is no record of their regarding the Galilaeans as heretics.

HENGEL (2692) mentions the 'Galilaeans' as one of the revolutionary groups and cites a cryptic reference to 'Galilaeans' in Bar-Kochba's correspondence found at Murabba'at. The simple explanation of this latter citation, we may respond, is that it refers to people from the geographical region of Galilee.

REICKE (2693), pp. 117–118, 137, in a generally conservative, popular account, views the term Galilaean as roughly equivalent to anarchist, but he hastens to add that at least as many revolts were caused by people outside Galilee.

HOEHNER (2694) seeks to clear the Galilaeans, including, implicitly, Jesus, from the charge of being trouble-makers.

MALINOWSKI (2695), perceiving that the Galilaeans showed deep concern for Jewish law and looked to Jerusalem as their religious center, notes that they provided more than a few outstanding leaders of the revolution. Yet he avoids identifying any revolutionary group as 'Galilaeans', correctly remarking, in fact, that the revolutionary Fourth Philosophy movement launched by Judas of Galilee never found universal support in Galilee itself and that members of his family went to Jerusalem whenever they needed support. Similarly, neither the Zealots nor the Sicarii are mentioned by Josephus as being present in Galilee.

VERMES (2696), without, to be sure, going so far as to suggest that Jesus was a Galilaean revolutionary, does, nevertheless, conclude that Jesus became a political suspect in the eyes of the rulers of Jerusalem because he was a Galilaean. We may remark, however, that VERMES offers little hard evidence to support this theory.

ZEITLIN (2697) agrees that the Galilaeans in the 'Life' are not a geographical but a revolutionary group and cites as evidence Life 381, which tells how Tiberias narrowly escaped being sacked by the Galilaeans. He says that the

counterparts in Jerusalem of the Galilaeans were the Sicarii. Since Tiberias was in Galilee, the name Galilaeans cannot be a geographical name, he says. We may comment that inasmuch as Josephus (Ant. 18. 37) says that the new settlers of Tiberias were a promiscuous rabble, "no small contingent being Galilaean", the term as applied to Tiberias refers to the Jews from the region of Galilee; certainly it would make no sense for Herod the Tetrach to settle revolutionaries in his newly established city. Again, Josephus (Against Apion 1. 48) recalls with pride that he was "in command of those whom we call Galilaeans", so long as resistance was possible. Josephus would hardly speak of his being in command of a revolutionary group. Moreover, we may ask, if the Galilaeans constituted a revolutionary group, why is there no mention of them outside of Galilee, and why are they not in the list of revolutionary groups in War 7. 259–274? Finally, in Life 381, Joseph speaks not of the Galilaeans but of Galilaeans: hence the reference is not to a party but to individuals from Galilee.

LOFTUS (2698) insists that the expression σύνταγμα τῶν Γαλιλαίων in Josephus (War 4. 558) does not indicate a geographical location or describe an organized influx of refugees from Galilee into Jerusalem but rather, as ZEITLIN (2697) has suggested, refers to a particular rebel group, namely the followers of John of Gischala. We may comment that the context, with the phrase κἂν τοῦτοισ, shows that the Galilaean contingent was part of the Zealots. The evidence cited by LOFTUS is all inferential: John of Gischala is never designated a Galilaean, as Loftus himself admits. Moreover, in the list of the five revolutionary groups (War 7. 262–274), three of the groups have generic names, but John of Gischala's followers are not identified as the Galilaeans (which would make them parallel with the Idumaeans, for example).

LOFTUS (2697a) (2698a) presents an interesting theory that the Galilaeans were favorably inclined toward the Hasmoneans because it was the latter who had brought them back into the Jewish state. He remarks that the most important trait in the Galilaean character which stemmed from the Maccabees was their readiness to commit suicide rather than to submit to Roman rule. He postulates that Ezekias the Galilaean (War 1. 204, Ant. 14. 159) was an aristocratic leader of a Hasmonean force in 47 B.C.E. (there is, however, we may note, no proof that he was a Hasmonean), and thus we have an historical link between the Hasmoneans and the Zealots; but, if so, we may ask, why does Josephus say that the Fourth Philosophy started with Judas of Galilee? Such a theory will explain the Galilaeans' support for Antigonus the Hasmonean in 40–37 B.C.E. LOFTUS identifies the old man who in 38 B.C.E. (War 1. 312–313, Ant. 14. 429–430) killed his family and himself, "thus submitting to death rather than to slavery", as presenting the teaching of Judas of Galilee; but, we may remark, the view is a commonplace, and there is no proof of any connection with Judas. LOFTUS' theory seeks to explain why Josephus was chosen commander in Galilee, namely, to guarantee local popular support. We may, however, comment that Josephus opposed the war and had much opposition in Galilee, especially from John of Gischala. LOFTUS interprets Menahem's appearance in the Temple in royal robes as an indication that the family of Ezekias regarded themselves as heirs to the Hasmonean throne. We may, however, suggest that such an appearance prob-

ably was an indication that Menahem was proclaiming himself the Messiah, though Josephus suppresses this fact.

COHEN (2699) agrees in disputing ZEITLIN's thesis.

### 22.39: The λησται

(2700) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.

COHEN (2700) stresses that not all the λησται, "brigands", were revolutionaries, that some were merely routine highway robbers. He concludes that in the Galilaean narrative of both the 'War' and the 'Life' λησται usually refers to brigands rather than to revolutionaries, but that the context of every occurrence must be investigated.

### 22.40: Individual Revolutionary Leaders: Judas of Galilee, John of Gischala, Simon bar Giora, Menahem

(2701) JOSEPH SPENCER KENNARD, JR.: Judas of Galilee and His Clan. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 36, 1945–46, pp. 281–286.

(2702) EMIL SCHÜRER: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 2 vols. 3rd–4th ed., Leipzig 1901–9.

(2703) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: John of Gischala and Simon bar Giora (in Hebrew). In: *Institute of Jewish Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem*, ed., *Studies in Memory of Asher Gulak and Shmuel Klein*. Jerusalem 1942. Pp. 153–170. Rpt. in his *When a Nation Fights for Its Freedom*. Tel-Aviv 1936. Pp. 295–330. Trans. into French by SAMUEL NISSENBAUM: *Quand une nation lutte pour sa liberté; essais d'histoire juive*. Le Caire 1940.

(2704) WILLIAM L. LANE: *Times of Refreshment: A Study of Eschatological Periodization in Judaism and Christianity*. Diss., Th.D., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1962.

(2705) OTTO MICHEL: Simon bar Giora. In: *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies*. Vol. 1. Jerusalem 1967. Pp. 77–80. (Abstract in: *Abstracts of Papers. Ancient Jewish History*. The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 25 July–1 Aug. 1965. Pp. 17–18). Rpt. in: *Studien zu Josephus: Simon bar Giora*. In: *New Testament Studies* 14, 1968, pp. 402–408.

(2705a) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: *L'Énigme des manuscrits de la Mer Morte*. Paris 1957. Trans. into English by H. GARNER: *The Riddle of the Scrolls*. London 1958.

(2705b) CECIL ROTH: *The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Oxford 1958. Trans. into Hebrew by DANIEL SHER. Tel-Aviv 1958.

(2705c) HAROLD H. ROWLEY: The Teacher of Righteousness and the Dead Sea Scrolls. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 40, 1957–58, pp. 114–146.

(2705d) MENAHEM STERN: The Directions in the Groups of the Fighters for Freedom at the End of the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: *Ha-Ishiyut vedorah: Ha-ḥevrah ha-historit ha-yisraelit*. Jerusalem 1963. Pp. 70–78.

(2705e) YITZHAK BAER: Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.

(2705ea) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.

- (2705f) DONALD E. GOWAN: *Bridge between the Testaments: A Reappraisal of Judaism from the Exile to the Birth of Christianity* (Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series, 14). Pittsburgh 1976.
- (2705g) MENAHEM STERN: *Sicarii and Zealots*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 263–301, 374–377.

KENNARD (2701) supports SCHÜRER's (2702) identification of Judas, the brigand chief who was subdued by Herod (War 2. 56, Ant. 17. 271) in 4 B.C.E. with the Judas who in 6 C.E. raised a rebellion against the Romans on the occasion of the census of Quirinius (War 2. 118, Ant. 18. 4–10, 23–25). We may reply that there are no less than fifteen men in the pages of Josephus bearing the name of Judas. Moreover, Josephus usually mentions a person's background or gives a cross-reference when introducing someone whom he has mentioned previously, whereas in War 2. 118 he speaks of a certain man (τις ἀνὴρ), implying, though admittedly not proving, that he has not been mentioned before. Similarly, two of the three major manuscripts in Antiquities 18. 4 read τις ἀνὴρ. Finally, the brigand chief is referred to as Judas the son of Ezekias, whereas the other is called simply Judas a Gaulanite (Ant. 18. 4) or Judas a Galilaean (War 2. 118).

KLAUSNER (2703), asking why Titus put Simon bar Giora and not John of Gischala to death, answers that this was because Simon chose new paths, whereas John was an ordinary rebel. The Romans, we may respond, were not so much interested in the novelty of a leader's ideas as in his effectiveness and power. Simon's army of about 15,000 was considerably larger than that of the other leaders and it was the best organized and disciplined: it was presumably on this basis that he was deemed the greater leader and hence put to death. As to the name Bar Giora, which means "son of a proselyte", KLAUSNER disputes Simon's proselyte origins and sees in the name a derogatory appellation; but if so, we may ask, why did he alone bear this appellation? Moreover, in view of the generally positive attitude toward proselytes in this period, at least officially, as noted above, it would hardly be derogatory to term someone 'son of a proselyte'.

LANE (2704), pp. 283–300, noting that according to Josephus (War 4. 575) the people within Jerusalem acclaimed Simon as savior (σωτήρ) and protector (κηδεμών), says that the movement that he led was messianic. We may comment that the fact that (War 7. 29) when Bar Giora was captured he was dressed in a white tunic covered over with a purple mantle and that he arose out of the ground, according to Josephus (*ibid.*), at the very spot where the Temple formerly stood, reinforces the Messianic picture.

MICHEL (2705) notes that though the picture of Bar Giora in Josephus is generally negative, we get clues to Simon's real personality and the differences between him and other revolutionary figures in War 4. 538–544, 5. 527–533, and 7. 26–36.

DEL MEDICO (2705a) and ROTH (2705b) argue that the Teacher of Righteousness is not Menahem (cf. War 2. 433ff.); but ROWLEY (2705c) argues against this hypothesis.

STERN (2705d) presents a survey of the leaders of the Great War against the Romans, especially John of Gischala, Menahem, and Simon bar Giora. He notes the similarities with the leaders who arose after the death of Herod and comments on the sources of the strength of the various movements.

BAER (2705e) rejects THACKERAY's (2705ea) view (p. 119) that Josephus' portrait of John of Gischala is based on that of Sallust's Catiline and argues that his prototype was the Athenian Cleon as portrayed by Thucydides and Aristophanes.

GOWAN (2705f) concludes that it is doubtful that Judas should be called the founder of the Sicarii or of the Zealots, since those groups are too particularized and too tenaciously linked with Judas for that, though it does seem that all the extremist movements were influenced by his teaching.

STERN (2705g) identifies Judah of Gaulanitis (the Galilaean, War 2. 117–118 and Ant. 18. 23–25) with Judah son of Hezekiah, who apparently was one of the chief rebels at the time of the outbreak of the revolution against Varus and whose main region of activity was Galilee (War 2. 56 and Ant. 17. 271–272). We may comment, however, that when Josephus first mentions Judas in the 'War' (2. 118), he introduces him as "a certain" (τις) Galilaean, "Judas by name", clearly implying that he had not been mentioned previously, whereas Judah the son of Hezekiah had been mentioned earlier in Book 2. As to John of Gischala, STERN notes that even Josephus does not make John an inveterate rebel, with views like those of the members of the Fourth Philosophy, and that the 'Life' (43) indicates that John was one of the moderates who tried to restrain the hot-heads of Gischala. Josephus' trustworthiness in the account of his dispute with John is certainly suspect; but there is also no doubt that John had a major role in the attempt to dismiss Josephus and that he was never suspected of national and social radicalism or of deviating from the policy of the leaders in Jerusalem.

## 23: Christianity

### 23.0: Josephus on John the Baptist

- (2706) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Death of John the Baptist (Ant. xviii. 116–119). Appendix M. In: Josephus, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965. P. 577.
- (2707) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: Josephus the Man and the Historian. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (2708) CHESTER C. McCOWN: The Scene of John's Ministry and Its Relation to the Purpose and Outcome of His Mission. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 59, 1940, pp. 113–131.
- (2709) ROBERT EISLER: Hebrew Scrolls: Further Evidence for Their Pre-Christian Date. In: *The Modern Churchman* 39, 1949, pp. 284–287.
- (2710) CARL H. KRAELING: John the Baptist. New York 1951.
- (2711) GEORGES ORY: La Samarie, patrie d'une Messie. In: *Cahiers du Cercle Ernest-Renan*. Vol. 3, no. 11. Paris 1956.
- (2712) WALTER BRANT: Wer war Jesus Christus? Verändern die Schriftrollenfunde vom Toten Meer unser Christusbild? Stuttgart 1957.
- (2713) ERNST BARNIKOL: Das Leben Jesu der Heilsgeschichte. Halle 1958.
- (2714) GUY SCHOFIELD: Crime before Calvary; Herodias, Herod Antipas, and Pontius Pilate: A New Interpretation. London 1960.
- (2715) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Duration of Jesus' Ministry. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 55, 1964–65, pp. 181–200.
- (2716) JOHN DUNCAN M. DERRETT: Herod's Oath and the Baptist's Head. In: *Biblische Zeitschrift* 9, 1965, pp. 49–59, 233–246.
- (2717) ROLAND SCHÜTZ: Johannes der Täufer (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 50). Zürich 1967.
- (2718) ANONYMOUS: Jean surnomme le Baptiste, selon Flavius Josèphe. In: *Foi et Vie* 68, no. 3, 1969, p. 88.
- (2719) HARTWIG THYEN: Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen. Göttingen 1970.
- (2720) LÉON HERRMANN: Hérodiade. In: *Revue des Études juives* 132, 1973, pp. 49–63.
- (2720a) MARIE-JOSEPH LAGRANGE: L'Évangile de Jésus-Christ. Avec la synopse évangilique traduite par le p. C. LAVERGNE. Paris 1928; new ed., 1954. Trans. into English by LUKE WALKER and REGINALD GINNS: *The Gospel of Jesus Christ*. 2 vols. Westminster, Md. 1938. Trans. into German: *Das Evangelium von Jesus Christus*. Heidelberg 1949.
- (2720b) HERBERT G. MARSH: The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism (Publications of the Univ. of Manchester, no. 275, Theological Series, no. 5). Manchester 1941.
- (2720c) JEAN STEINMANN: Saint Jean-Baptiste et la spiritualité du désert. Paris 1955.
- (2720d) EUGENIUSZ DĄBROWSKI: Nowy Testament na tle epoki. Vol. 1: Geografia-Historia. Poznań 1958.
- (2720e) PIERRE BENOIT: Qumrân et le Nouveau Testament. In: *New Testament Studies* 7, 1960–61, pp. 276–292. Trans. into English: *Qumran and the New Testament*. In:

- JEROME MURPHY-O'CONNOR, ed., *Paul and Qumran. Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Chicago 1968. Pp. 1–30.
- (2720f) JEAN DANIELOU: *Jean-Baptiste Témoin de l'Agneau*. Paris 1964. Trans. into English: *The Work of John the Baptist*. Baltimore-Dublin 1966.
- (2720g) TRAUGOTT HOLTZ: *Die Standespredigt Johannes des Täuflers. Ruf und Antwort*. In: *Festschrift Ernst Fuchs*. Leipzig 1964. Pp. 461–474.
- (2720h) CHARLES H. H. SCOBIE: *John the Baptist*. London 1964.
- (2720i) JOSEF A. SINT: *Die Eschatologie des Täuflers, die Täufergruppen und die Polemik der Evangelien*. In: KURT SCHUBERT, ed., *Vom Messias zum Christus*. Wien 1964. Pp. 55–163.
- (2720j) GÜNTER SPEICHER: *Doch sie können ihn nicht töten. Forscher und Theologen auf den Spuren Jesu*. Düsseldorf–Wien 1966.
- (2720k) WALTER WINK: *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (originally diss., Union Theological Seminary, New York) (Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series, 7). Cambridge 1968.
- (2720l) EMANUEL BIN GORION: *The Paths of Legend. An Introduction to Folktales* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1949; 2nd ed., Jerusalem 1970.
- (2720m) FRITZ LEO LENTZEN-DEIS: *Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synoptikern. Literaturkritische und gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Frankfurter Theologische Studien, Bd. 4). Frankfurt-am-Main 1970.
- (2720n) JOACHIM GNILKA: *Das Martyrium Johannes' des Täuflers (Mk 6, 17–29)*. In: PAUL HOFMANN, NORBERT BRER, WILHELM PESCH, edd., *Orientierung an Jesus; zur Theologie der Synoptiker. Für Josef Schmid*. Freiburg 1973. Pp. 78–92.
- (2720o) MORTON SMITH: *Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark*. Cambridge, Mass. 1973.
- (2720p) PAUL JOHNSON: *A History of Christianity*. London 1976.
- (2720q) JEAN STARCKY: *S. Jean Baptiste et les Esséniens*. In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 180, 1976, pp. 6–8.
- (2720r) ROBERT M. GRANT: *Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews*. In: *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, vol. 2, ed. PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 69–86.
- (2720s) SAMUEL TOBIAS LACHS: *John the Baptist and His Audience*. In: *Gratz College Annual of Jewish Studies* 4, 1975, pp. 28–32.
- (2720t) D. LOSADA: *La muerte de Juan el Bautista. Mc 6, 17–29*. In: *Revista biblica* (Buenos Aires) 39, 1977, pp. 143–154.
- (2720u) BARBARA E. THIERING: *Redating the Teacher of Righteousness* (Australian and New Zealand Studies in Theology and Religion, 1). Sydney 1979.

I (2706) have a select bibliography on John the Baptist, particularly Josephus' account of his death as compared with that in the New Testament.

Three problems in connection with John have been dealt with more than any others, namely the genuineness of the passage in Josephus (Ant. 18. 116–119), Josephus' silence regarding his connection with Jesus, and the apparent discrepancies between his account and that in the Gospels.

THACKERAY (2707), a most discerning student of Josephus' language, notes that the passage about John has a number of characteristics in common with this part of the 'Antiquities' and not with others, such as the love of periphrasis (e.g., "consort with baptism" for "be baptized") and the use of unusual words for "punish", "kill", and "sin", as well as such words and phrases as ἀκρόασις, φέρειν ἐπὶ τινι, and τοσόσδε. THACKERAY ascribes such words to the Thucydidean hack who, he says, helped Josephus with Books 17–19, but this



may merely, we suggest, reflect Josephus' source. The best proof that the passage is genuine is that Origen, who explicitly states that Josephus did not believe in Jesus as the Christ and hence did not have the "Testimonium Flavianum", at least as it stands in all our manuscripts, does cite this passage about John. Moreover, if the passage were interpolated by a Christian, it is hard to believe that he would not have associated John with Jesus and that he would not have connected the death of John with John's rebuke to Herod Antipas about his wife Herodias as in the Gospels.

As to the reason for Josephus' silence about John's connection with Jesus, we may suggest that one reason may be that Josephus was wary about speaking of Messianic movements for fear of Roman disapproval.

Josephus (Ant. 18. 118) says that Herod Antipas put John to death because he feared that his eloquence, which was attracting crowds, might lead to some form of sedition; but the Gospels (Matthew 14. 3–12, Mark 6. 17–29) state that John was imprisoned because he questioned Herod's right to marry his sister-in-law, an event which Josephus (Ant. 18. 110) mentions but which he does not connect with John. We may suggest that there is no necessary contradiction between Josephus and the Gospels as to the reason why John was put to death: the Christians chose to emphasize the moral charges that he brought against the ruler, whereas Josephus stresses the political fears that he aroused in Herod.

MCCOWN (2708) reconciles Josephus with the Gospel account of John's death (Matthew 14. 3–4). Neither Josephus nor the Gospel report, he accurately notes, proves that John was planning a military attack, but both make it clear why John should have been accused of doing so; we may add that the reason for the association of John and Jesus may have been that both were feared because of their ability to arouse large crowds and hence were regarded as possible revolutionaries.

EISLER (2709), without cogent evidence, identifies the high priest in the Dead Sea Scrolls' 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness' with John the Baptist, who appears in Josippon as the high priest slain by Herod Agrippa.

KRAELING (2710), p. 34, suggests that Josephus toned down John's message until it became no more than an encomium of virtue, with the purification of the body by baptism thrown in for good measure. We may object that in view of the brevity of the passage about John (Ant. 18. 116–119) the role of baptism is certainly prominent. This is not surprising in view of the fact that Josephus, according to his own statement (Life 12), spent three years with a hermit named Bannus, who engaged in frequent ablutions.

ORY (2711) presents the fantastic equation that John = Theudas (Ant. 20. 97–98) = Dositheus (the Samaritan false Messiah who was contemporary with Jesus) = Jesus. We may comment that Josephus could hardly have spoken so highly as he does of John if the latter were a prophet of the hated Samaritans.

BRANT (2712), pp. 120–122, asks why John in Josephus has nothing of Messianic preaching and answers that Josephus is trying to make Judaism palatable to his Greek readers. We may note that inasmuch as he calls John a "good" man (Ant. 18. 117), he could hardly have made of him a political rebel (since the prevailing view of the Messiah was that of a political figure).

BARNIKOL (2713) has a brief commentary on *Antiquities* 18. 116–119.

SCHOFIELD (2714), especially pp. 120–122, comparing the accounts of John's death in Josephus and Mark, plausibly concludes that both can be true in the sense that Josephus chose the general charge whereas Mark chose a specific charge. SCHOFIELD is, however, highly speculative when he says that Herodias, the wife of Herod Antipas, played an important part in the events preceding Calvary.

ZEITLIN (2715) concludes that the Gospels are in error in omitting and that Josephus is right in stating that John's execution was due to political reasons. But, as we have noted above, the charges may supplement each other.

DERRETT (2716) resolves the apparent contradiction between the Gospels and Josephus by postulating that behind them both lay a third account, which definitely attributed John's death to his denunciation of Herod Antipas' marriage with Herodias. Herod, he says, interpreted his oath (Mark 6. 26) as the Pharisees would have; but he was hardly observant, as witness his marriage to his brother's wife. The dilemma of whether to fulfill his oath, says DERRETT, was at an end once Herod had decided to treat John as a political offender.

SCHÜTZ (2717), pp. 17–18, argues that Josephus had access to the synoptic tradition for his portrait of John the Baptist. He, especially pp. 13–27, concludes that Josephus' account of John is not polemical even though he approaches the subject from a Pharisaic point of view and even though he suppresses John's Messianic aspect for the sake of his Roman readers. We may comment that Josephus nowhere connects John with the characteristically Pharisaic view of the Oral Torah or, what to him was the most prominent point of difference, the attitude toward fate.

An ANONYMOUS (2718) author merely quotes *Antiquities* 18. 116–119, together with a brief statement of the context.

THYEN (2719), pp. 131–133, says that Josephus' account speaks indirectly for the view that the baptism of John did not accomplish any forgiveness of sins (*Ant.* 18. 117). He says that in his tendentiousness, Josephus has concealed completely the apocalyptic aspect of John and that as a Jew he wishes to make clear to his pagan readers that there are no sacraments analogous to the pagan mysteries. We may comment that Philo, at least, did not regard it as contradictory to Judaism to say that Moses initiated the Israelites into the mysteries (μυσταγωγῶν, *De Virtutibus* 178).

HERRMANN (2720) notes that in neither the Slavonic version of the *War* (2. 9. 7) nor in the *Antiquities* 18. 116–119 is Herodias or Salome responsible for the death of John, as is the case in the Gospels. He suggests that the fact that Josephus makes Herodias responsible for the disgrace and exile of Herod Antipas is due to his partiality to Herod Agrippa, who was on bad terms with Herodias, but he concludes that the information in Christian sources (the Gospels and the Sibylline Oracles 1. 336ff.) relating to Herodias and Agrippa is to be used with great caution.

LAGRANGE (2720a), pp. 219–224, concludes that Josephus' account of John the Baptist owes nothing to the Gospels and that the Gospels do not depend upon Josephus, so different is the view of John's death in each case. Yet,

he adds, their agreement is beyond question; and without Mark's account the facts cannot be properly understood. The true motive for John's death, he concludes, stems from the character of Herod Antipas as portrayed by Josephus – a prudent ruler, friendly to all, when not led astray by his wife.

MARSH (2720b), pp. 48–51, accepts the authenticity of Josephus' passage about John the Baptist and explains the apparent discrepancy between Josephus and the Gospels by asserting that Josephus' omission of the apocalyptic element in John's message is due to the fact that it would have evoked little interest in the majority of Josephus' readers. His omission of the Messianic context is due, he says, to the fact that it would have left an unfavorable response on the minds of the governing class. MARSH, pp. 62–64, harmonizes Josephus with the Gospel account with regard to the purpose of baptism.

STEINMANN (2720c), pp. 91–99, is an oversimplified, popular work, which maintains that Josephus' account of John the Baptist, as well as of his martyrdom, is in accord with that in the Gospels.

I have been unable to read DĄBROWSKI (2720d), pp. 268–271, on Josephus' passage (Ant. 18. 116–119) concerning John the Baptist.

BENOIT (2720e) says that what Josephus incorrectly writes about John the Baptist is true, in fact, of the Essenes; but no one has as yet proved that they practiced a baptism of initiation which had a moral value.

DANIÉLOU (2720f), pp. 157–172 (English translation, pp. 127–139), commenting on Josephus' account of John's death, says that to see Antipas as merely an ambitious and seditious politician, as does Josephus, is to restrict his struggle with John to a political conflict and to miss the religious meaning of the situation.

I have not seen HOLTZ (2720g), who comments on the affinity between Luke 3. 10–14 and Antiquities 18. 117.

SCOBIE (2720h), pp. 17–22, declares that if the passage in Josephus were interpolated by a Christian we would expect at least some witness to John's preaching of the Messiah and to his testimony to Jesus. We may, however, suggest that the interpolation might have been made by followers of John, such as the Mandaeans, who did not recognize the claims of Jesus. SCOBIE regards Josephus' account as one-sided but as largely the truth. He regards the passage about John in the Slavonic Josephus as of extremely doubtful value, since it was translated from Greek in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and not from a domestic original, since it contains historical errors, and since it is very anti-Roman in tone, in contrast to Josephus' attitude. SCOBIE, pp. 110–111, believes that Josephus' statement that John's baptism was for purification of the body is not based on first-hand evidence and may have been due to Josephus' assumption that John's baptism was identical with Bannus'. We may, however, reply that this is unlikely, inasmuch as Josephus takes the trouble to say specifically that John's baptism was intended as a consecration of the body and inasmuch as Josephus uses special words, βαπτισμῷ and βάπτισιν, for John's baptism. SCOBIE suggests that Josephus' statement that John's baptism was not for the remission of sins is an attempt to dissociate him from the new sect of the Christians. He asks why John should have been termed the Baptist and why he

attracted crowds if there was nothing special about his baptism, and concludes, therefore, that Josephus' view is to be rejected in favor of that in the Gospels. But, we may respond, Josephus does ascribe something special to Josephus' baptism. SCOBIE says that the phrase βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι does not indicate that those baptized were initiated into a sect; rather it means that people were invited to come in numbers rather than each one separately. As to the accounts of John's arrest, imprisonment, and death, both Josephus and the Gospels are basically reliable and are complementary rather than contradictory. As to the chronological difficulty, that on the basis of Luke 3.1 John died in 29–30, whereas the defeat of Herod Antipas at the hands of Aretas, which Josephus says was regarded as divine punishment for his execution of John, took place in 36, SCOBIE suggests that the death of John may have made such an impression that it was easily brought forward as the explanation of events which took place five or six years earlier. A parallel, we may add, may be found in the attempt in later Christian historiography to connect the crucifixion of Jesus with the destruction of the Temple forty years later.

I have not seen SINT (2720i).

SPEICHER (2720j), pp. 276–279, notes that according to the Gospels of Matthew and Luke it was not John but Jesus who said that he who serves a divorce breaks his marriage vow, and concludes that a saying of John has been put into the mouth of Jesus. He suggests that there must be other cases of this sort. We may remark that the striking fact that Josephus devotes twice as much space to John as to Jesus (even if the 'Testimonium Flavianum' is authentic) would support a view that actually John was the more important; or, alternatively, perhaps both shared this view, with Jesus deriving it from John.

WINK (2720k), p. 116, quotes part of Josephus' passage about John in English translation.

BIN GORION (2720l), p. 165, raises the question whether the story of John the Baptist's death in Josephus is legend or fact.

LENTZEN-DEIS (2720m), pp. 60–64, notes that Josephus uses totally different terminology for the bathing of the Essenes as against that of John the Baptist, and remarks that whereas the Essenes were a closed group, John's was not.

GNILKA (2720n), pp. 87–91, says that Josephus does not exploit the folkloristic tradition found in the Gospels concerning John. He excludes the possibility that Josephus had access to the synoptic tradition and concludes that as a historical kernel only the fact remains that Herod Antipas had John put to death; the remainder of the account in the Gospels is folklore.

SMITH (2720o), pp. 206–207, concludes that the Gospel account is confirmed by Josephus. He asserts that the object of the polemic in the Qumran Manual of Discipline 3.4ff. against the notion that baptism can remit sins is John; and this is made very likely by the fact that Josephus saw fit to defend him against such charges and to insist that he required repentance as a prerequisite for his physical cleansing.

JOHNSON (2720p), p. 20, asserts that Josephus shows that John was at one time an Essene.

I have not seen STARCKY (2720q). [See *infra*, p. 957.]

GRANT (2720r) asserts that Origen's statement that John's baptism was "for the remission of sins" is thoroughly Christian, since Josephus (whose account of John he definitely knew) did not use this expression.

LACHS (2720s) concludes, from the fact that Josephus (Ant. 18. 118) says that "others" (τῶν ἄλλων) joined the crowds about him, that non-Jews, including tax-collectors and soldiers (Luke 3. 12–14 and Matthew 21. 32) also came, and that this will account for Herod's alarm. We may comment that while it is true that the proselyting movement (not mentioned by LACHS) was particularly strong at this time, it is unlikely that in this context "others", without further explanation, could refer to non-Jews, since any reader of Josephus would assume that in this context only Jews could be meant. We may further add that though the word "others" occurs in the best Greek manuscripts, the Latin translation of Josephus, which often has great value for establishing the Greek text, has "a very large multitude" (*per plurima multitudo*).

I have not seen LOSADA (2720t).

THIERING (2720u) argues that the Qumran community was founded ca. 6, and that the Teacher of Righteousness appeared twenty years later and may well have been John the Baptist.

### 23.1: The 'Testimonium Flavianum' on Jesus: Bibliography

- (2721) ROBERT EISLER: The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus' Recently Rediscovered 'Capture of Jerusalem' (trans. into English by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE of his: *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*). London 1931.
- (2722) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the *Testimonium Flavianum* (Ant. xviii. 63–64). Appendix K. In: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965. Pp. 573–575.
- (2723) PAUL WINTER: Bibliography to Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae*, XVIII, 63, 64. In: *Journal of Historical Studies* 2, 1969–70, pp. 292–296.
- (2724) EMIL SCHÜRER: The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135). Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973. Pp. 428–430.
- (2724a) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: Le témoignage de Josèphe sur Jésus d'après des publications récentes. In: *Revue Biblique* 84, 1977, pp. 38–58.
- (2724b) ALBERT A. BELL, JR.: Josephus the Satirist? A Clue to the Original Form of the *Testimonium Flavianum*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 67, 1976, pp. 16–22.
- (2724c) ERNST BAMMEL: Zum Testimonium Flavianum (Jos. Ant. 18, 63–64). In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 9–22.
- (2724d) PAUL WINTER: Josephus on Jesus. In: *Journal of Historical Studies* 1, 1968, pp. 289–302. Revised in: EMIL SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*. Revised and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973. Pp. 428–441.
- (2724e) WALTER PÖTSCHER: Iosephus Flavius, *Antiquitates* 18, 63f. (Sprachliche Form und thematischer Inhalt). In: *Eranos* 73, 1975, pp. 26–42.

- (2724f) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: Le témoignage de Josèphe sur Jésus d'après la tradition indirecte. In: *Revue Biblique* 80, 1973, pp. 481–513.
- (2724g) A. FEUILLET: Les anciens historiens profanes et la connaissance de Jésus. In: *Esprit et Vie* 87, 1977, pp. 145–153.

There is no single topic in connection with Josephus that has occasioned more comment than the question of the authenticity of the so-called 'Testimonium Flavianum' concerning Jesus (Ant. 18. 63–64).

EISLER (2721), pp. 36ff., has a long list of treatments of the subject before 1930.

I (2722) have a select bibliography without comment.

WINTER (2723) has a more select bibliography, classified in three groups (with occasional quotations) – defending authenticity, against authenticity, and maintaining the theory of interpolation. Within each group the arrangement is chronological. This has been revised and reprinted in the new SCHÜRER (2724), pp. 428–430.

DUBARLE (2724a) reviews a number of recent publications on the subject critically. He is unconvinced by the suggestion of BELL (2724b) and Bammel (2724c) that the incident which follows the 'Testimonium', the Paulina-Mundus story (Ant. 18. 65–80), originally poked fun at the Christian doctrine of the virgin birth of Jesus. He criticizes the reconstructions of the 'Testimonium' by WINTER (2724d), Bammel (2724c), and Pötscher (2724e) as being based only on the 'received text' and on Origen's statement that Josephus did not believe in Jesus as the Messiah and as ignoring the indirect tradition. DUBARLE adheres to the reconstruction that he had proposed in 1973 (2724f). In a postscript he comments on the article by FEUILLET (2724g) concerning a new Arabic witness to the 'Testimonium', the text of Kitāb al-Kāfi of Gerasime (thirteenth century), which omits the phrase "master of men who receive the truth gladly", though he admits that such an omission may be due to the influence of the copyist.

### 23.2: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': General

- (2725) ROBERT EISLER: IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30. Trans. into English by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE: The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus' Recently Rediscovered 'Capture of Jerusalem'. London 1931.
- (2726) ROBERT EISLER: Flavius Josephus-Studien, I: Das Testimonium Flavianum. Eine Antwort an Dr. Walther Bienert. London 1938.
- (2727) WALTHER BIENERT: Der älteste nichtchristliche Jesusbericht. Josephus über Jesus. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des altrussischen 'Josephus'. Halle 1936.
- (2728) H. W. KARS: Der älteste nichtchristliche Jesusbericht. In: *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 108, 1937–38, pp. 40–64.
- (2729) AGOSTINO GOETHALS: La versione slava di Giuseppe Flavio. In: *Religio* 14, 1938, pp. 250–265.
- (2730) MARTIN DIBELIUS: Jesus. Berlin 1939. Trans. of second edition into English by CHARLES B. HEDRICK and FREDERICK C. GRANT: Jesus. Philadelphia 1949.
- (2731) CH. MARTIN: Le 'Testimonium Flavianum'. Vers une solution définitive? In: *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 20, 1941, pp. 409–465.

- (2732) HENDRIK VAN DER LOOS: Jezus Messias-Koning. Een speciaal Onderzoek naar de Vraag of Jezus van Nazaret politieke Bedoelingen heeft nagestreeft (Academisch Proefschrift). Assen 1942.
- (2733) KARL L. SCHMIDT: Der Todesprozess des Messias Jesus: Die Verantwortung der Juden, Heiden und Christen für die Kreuzigung Jesu Christi. In: *Judaica* (Zürich) 1, 1945, pp. 1–40.
- (2734) MANUEL TARRÉS: Flavio Josefo y su testimonio sobre Jesús de Nazaret. In: *Cultura Bíblica* 3, 1946, pp. 314–316.
- (2735) BEN-ZION KATZ: Pharisees, Sadducees, Zealots, Christians. A New View in the Investigation of Jewish History (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1947.
- (2736) JOSEPH SPENCER KENNARD, JR.: Gleanings from the Slavonic Josephus Controversy. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 161–170.
- (2737) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Hoax of the 'Slavonic Josephus'. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 171–180.
- (2738) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI: Vita di Gesù Cristo. Milano 1941. Trans. into French by MAURICE VAUSSARD: Vie de Jésus Christ. Paris 1947. Trans. (of 6th ed.) into German: Das Leben Jesu. Basel 1949. Trans. into English by ALBA I. ZIZZAMIA: The Life of Christ. Milwaukee 1947.
- (2739) JACOB ZLOTNIK: Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 13, 1949–50, pp. 19–35, 185–193.
- (2740) MORRIS GOLDSTEIN: Jesus in the Jewish Tradition. New York 1950.
- (2740a) MAX MEINERTZ: Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 5th. ed., Paderborn 1950. Pp. 198–199.
- (2741) FELIX SCHEIDWEILER: Sind die Interpolationen im altrussischen Josephus wertlos? In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43, 1950–51, pp. 155–178.
- (2742) FELIX SCHEIDWEILER: Das Testimonium Flavianum. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 45, 1954, pp. 230–243.
- (2743) JUURD H. STELMA: Flavius Josefus. In: JAN H. WASZINK et al., ed., *Het oudste Christendom en de antieke cultuur*. Vol. 1. Haarlem 1951. Pp. 583–588.
- (2744) VOJTĚCH SANDA: Flavius Josephus o Ježíši Kristu (in Czech). In: *Duchovní pastýř* (Praha) 2, 1952, pp. 53–56, 71–73.
- (2745) RODERIC DUNKERLEY: The Riddles of Josephus. In: *Hibbert Journal* 53, 1954–55, pp. 127–134.
- (2746) JOSEF BLINZLER: Der Prozess Jesu. Das jüdische und das römische Gerichtsverfahren gegen Jesus auf Grund der ältesten Zeugnisse dargestellt und beurteilt. Regensburg 1955. Trans. (of 2nd. ed.) into English by ISABEL and FLORENCE McHUGH: The Trial of Jesus. The Jewish and Roman Proceedings against Jesus Christ Described and Assessed from the Oldest Accounts. Westminster, Maryland 1959. Trans. into Spanish: Barcelona 1959. Trans. into French by G. DAUBIÉ: Le procès de Jésus. Tours 1962. Trans. into Swedish: Stockholm 1962. Trans. into Italian by COLAO PELLIZZARI: Il processo di Gesù. Brescia 1966.
- (2747) CHARLES K. BARRETT, ed.: The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. London 1956. Trans. into German by CARSTEN COLPE: Die Umwelt des Neuen Testaments. Ausgewählte Quellen. Tübingen 1959.
- (2748) ERNST BARNIKOL: Das Leben Jesu der Heilsgeschichte. Halle 1958.
- (2749) MEREDITH F. ELLER: The Beginnings of the Christian Religion. A Guide to the History and Literature of Judaism and Christianity. New York 1958.
- (2750) WALTER BAUER: Das angebliche Zeugnis des Josephus. In: EDGAR HENNECKE and WILHELM SCHNEEMELCHER, ed., *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*. Vol. 1. Tübingen 1959. Trans. into English by A. J. B. HIGGINS et al., ed. by R. McL. WILSON. Philadelphia 1963.
- (2751) HANS CONZELMANN: Jesus Christus. In: *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Vol. 3. 3rd. ed., Tübingen 1959. Pp. 619–653.

- (2752) WILLIAM L. DULIÈRE: Inventaire de quarante-et-un porteurs du nom de Jésus dans l'histoire juive écrite en grec. In: *Novum Testamentum* 3, 1959, pp. 180–217.
- (2753) JOSÉ MÚNERA: Eco insigne de Judaísmo. In: *Estudios Eclesiásticos* 33, 1959, pp. 441–446.
- (2754) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Studies in Josephus*. London 1961.
- (2755) FERDINAND HAHN: Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus und die Eigenart der uns zur Verfügung stehenden Quellen. In: FERDINAND HAHN, WENZEL LOHFF, and GÜNTER BORNKAMM, *Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus*. Göttingen 1962. Pp. 7–40. Trans. into English by GROVER FOLEY: *What Can We Know about Jesus? Essays on the New Quest*. Philadelphia 1969.
- (2756) THOMAS W. MANSON: *The Life of Jesus. A Study of the Available Materials*. 1943. In: THOMAS W. MANSON, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, ed. by MATTHEW BLACK, Manchester 1962. Pp. 13–27.
- (2757) CARLO M. MARTINI: Il silenzio dei testimoni non christiani su Gesù. In: *La Civiltà Cattolica* 113. 2, 1962, pp. 341–349.
- (2758) FLOYD V. FILSON: *A New Testament History: The Story of the Emerging Church*. Philadelphia 1964. Trans. into German by FRANZ J. SCHIERSE: *Geschichte des Christentums in neutestamentlicher Zeit*. Düsseldorf 1967.
- (2759) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: L'originalité du témoignage de Flavius Josèphe sur Jésus. In: *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 52, 1964, pp. 177–203.
- (2760) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Ce que Josèphe a dit de Jésus (Ant. XVIII 63–64). In: *Revue des Études juives* 124, 1965, pp. 9–21.
- (2761) THÉODORE REINACH: Josèphe sur Jésus. In: *Revue des Études juives* 35, 1897, pp. 1–18.
- (2762) GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON: *The World of Josephus*. London 1964.
- (2763) BRUCE M. METZGER: *The New Testament: Its Background, Growth, and Content*. Nashville 1965.
- (2764) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity*. Manchester 1967.
- (2765) HAIM COHN: *The Trial and Death of Jesus (in Hebrew)*. Tel-Aviv 1968. Trans. into English: New York 1971.
- (2766) HENRI CAZELLES: *Naissance de l'Église. Secte juive rejetée?* Paris 1968.
- (2767) PAUL WINTER: The Trial of Jesus. In: *Commentary* 38, Sept. 1964, pp. 35–41.
- (2768) PAUL WINTER: Josephus on Jesus. In: *Journal of Historical Studies* 1, 1968, pp. 289–302. Revised in: EMIL SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)*. Revised and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973. Pp. 428–441.
- (2769) ROBERT W. CRAPPS, EDGAR V. MCKNIGHT, and DAVID A. SMITH: *Introduction to the New Testament*. New York 1969.
- (2770) LOUIS PRÉCHAC: Réflexions sur le "Testimonium Flavianum". In: *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 1969, pp. 101–111.
- (2771) ROBERT A. SPIVEY, and DWIGHT MOODY SMITH, JR.: *Anatomy of the New Testament: A Guide to Its Structure and Meaning*. New York 1969.
- (2772) HOWARD C. KEE: *Jesus in History: An Approach to the Study of the Gospels*. New York 1970.
- (2773) STANLEY G. LEUTY: *An Inquiry into the Historical Methods and Contributions of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., M.A., California State College at Fullerton, California 1971 (available from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan).
- (2774) J. LOSADA: El testimonio de Josefo sobre Jesus. In: *Sal Terrae* 60, 1972, pp. 284–292.
- (2774a) GÖSTA LINDESKOG: *Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitlichen Judentum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Leipzig and Uppsala 1938; rpt. Darmstadt 1973.
- (2774b) CHARLES HAINCHELIN: *Les origines de la religion*. Paris 1950; 2nd ed., 1955.
- (2774c) RAYMOND SCHMITTEIN: *Circonstances et cause de la mort du Christ*. Baden-Baden 1950. Trans. into German: *Umstände und Ursache von Jesu Tod*. Mainz 1951.



- (2774d) CHARLES GUIGNEBERT: *Le Monde Juif vers le temps de Jésus*. Paris 1935. Trans. into English: *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus*. London 1939; New York 1959.
- (2774e) FRANÇOIS-M. BRAUN: *Où en est le problème de Jésus?* Bruxelles—Paris 1952.
- (2774g) RODERIC DUNKERLEY: *Beyond the Gospels*. Baltimore 1957.
- (2774h) MICHA J. (EMANUEL) BIN GORION (BERDICEWSKI): *Jeschu ben Chanan* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1959.
- (2774i) PHILIP SEIDENSTICKER: *Außerchristliche Jesuszeugnisse*. In: *Ut omnes unum sint* (Paderborn) 24, 1961, pp. 3–6.
- (2774j) ROBERT M. GRANT: *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*. New York 1963.
- (2774k) WERNER KOCH: *Der Prozeß Jesu. Versuch eines Tatsachenberichtes*. Köln 1966.
- (2774l) GÜNTER SPEICHER: *Doch sie können ihn nicht töten. Forscher und Theologen auf den Spuren Jesu*. Düsseldorf—Wien 1966.
- (2774m) WOLFGANG TRILLING: *Fragen zur Geschichtlichkeit Jesu*. 2nd ed., Düsseldorf 1967. Trans. into French by JOSEPH SCHMITT: *Jésus devant l'histoire*. Paris 1968.
- (2774n) SCHALOM BEN-CHORIN: *Jesus im Judentum*, Wuppertal 1970.
- (2774o) LÉON HERRMANN: *Chrestos. Témoignages païens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle*. Bruxelles 1970.
- (2774p) W(OLFGANG) SPEYER: *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung*. München 1971.
- (2774q) HENRI DANIEL-ROPS: *Jésus en son temps*. Paris 1945.
- (2774r) MORTON S. ENSLIN, rev.: HENRI DANIEL-ROPS, *Jésus en son temps*. In: *Judaism* 21, 1972, p. 231.
- (2774s) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: *Jésus d'après Flavius Josèphe*. In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 154, 1973, pp. 22–23.
- (2774t) GEORGES ORY: *Le mythe et l'histoire*. In: *Cahiers du Cercle Ernest Renan* 21/80, 1973, pp. 1–8.
- (2774u) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *Jesus and Christian Origins outside the New Testament*. Grand Rapids 1974.
- (2774v) WALTER PÖTSCHER: *Iosephus Flavius, Antiquitates* 18, 63f. (Sprachliche Form und thematischer Inhalt). In: *Eranos* 73, 1975, pp. 26–42.
- (2774w) P. KRIJBOLDER: *Jezus de Nazoreeër. Een studie over de Historiciteit van Jezus en de Oorsprong van het Christendom*. Amsterdam 1976.
- (2774x) ZVI BARAS: *Testimonium Flavianum: The State of Recent Scholarship*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 303–313, 378–385.
- (2774y) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: *Le témoignage de Josèphe sur Jésus d'après des publications récentes*. In: *Revue Biblique* 84, 1977, pp. 38–58.
- (2774z) ERNST BAMMEL: *Zum Testimonium Flavianum (Jos. Ant. 18, 63–64)*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 9–22.
- (2774za) A. FEUILLET: *Les anciens historiens profanes et la connaissance de Jésus*. In: *Esprit et Vie* 87.10, 1977, pp. 145–153.
- (2774zb) MICHAEL J. COOK: *Jesus and the Pharisees – The Problem as It Stands Today*. In: *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 15, 1978, pp. 441–460.
- (2774zc) ROBERT M. GRANT: *Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews*. In: *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, vol. 2, ed. PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER. Missoula, Montana 1979, pp. 69–86.
- (2774zd) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *The Testimonium Flavianum: The State of the Question*. In: ROBERT F. BERKEY and SARAH A. EDWARDS, edd., *Christological Perspectives: Essays in Honor of Harvey K. McArthur*. New York 1982. Pp. 179–199. 288–293.

- (2774ze) J. SALVADOR: É Autêntico o 'Testimonium Flavianum'? In: *Revista de Cultura Bíblica* (São Paulo) 2, 1978, pp. 137–151.
- (2774zf) WILLIAM D. DAVIES: *Invitation to the New Testament: A Guide to Its Main Writings*. London 1967.
- (2774zg) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *The Rise of Christianity*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1.8)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 187–262, 367–373.

Though his work appeared before the period under review, we should mention the stir created by EISLER's (2725) extraordinarily detailed and extremely learned, though erratic, attempt to show that our text represents the result of tampering by Christian censors who inserted their own interpolations. Despite his erudition, EISLER had an ability of tearing passages out of their context and of twisting the meanings of words to suit his theory. EISLER's work, however, won the support of only one really important student of Josephus, THACKERAY, who had originally believed the whole to be a Christian interpolation but who, under EISLER's influence, came to regard it as partly interpolated. We may comment that, while EISLER's attempted restoration of the original text of the 'Testimonium' appears arbitrary, his notion that the text as we have it has a substratum of authentic material seems increasingly confirmed by stylistic studies of it. For a number of years EISLER produced a stream of articles vigorously defending his position with regard to the 'Testimonium' and the Slavonic Josephus, and his last word (2726) was a very sharply worded typewritten polemic against BIENERT (2727).

KARS (2728) contends that the 'Testimonium' contains phrases interpolated by a Johannine Christian and attempts, largely following BIENERT, to reconstruct the Ur-text.

GOETHALS (2729) agrees with EISLER that in the 'Testimonium' we have an interpolated text; but he, unlike EISLER, despairs of restoring what Josephus himself wrote.

DIBELIUS (2730), pp. 13–14, concludes that the passage is a Christian interpolation or at least has been worked over by a Christian hand.

MARTIN (2731) presents the hypothesis – it is hardly a definitive solution – that originally Josephus merely reported the beginnings and early progress of the Christians, and that Eusebius, on the basis of Origen's marginal comments 'correcting' Josephus, wrote the passage as we have it.

I have not seen VAN DER LOOS (2732), who discusses both the 'Testimonium' (pp. 207–210) and the corresponding passage in the Slavonic Josephus (pp. 211–216).

SCHMIDT (2733) argues that the words used for accusation on the part of the Jews and of punishment on the part of Pilate sound more like Josephus' vocabulary than an interpolator's.

I have not seen TARRÉS (2734).

KATZ (2735), pp. 258–262, dogmatically concludes that the 'Testimonium' is completely forged.

KENNARD (2736) notes that even in the seventeenth century it is alleged that Thomas Gale of Cambridge had large fragments of Josephus which are not in the *textus receptus*.

ZEITLIN (2737), who regards the 'Testimonium' as a forgery, suggests two reasons for Josephus' silence concerning Jesus: 1) We do not know how popular Jesus was in the Roman world at that time; and 2) the fact that Jesus' followers were accused of setting fire to Rome was a good reason for Josephus not to mention Jesus, since the early Christians were regarded as a Jewish dissenting party. We may add that perhaps the reason Josephus did not mention the great fire in Rome, even though he was there at almost precisely that time (64 B.C.E.), may be that he wanted to suppress alleged Jewish-Christian culpability.

RICCIOTTI (2738) concludes that the passage is, in substance, genuine, but then adds that it is equally possible and, indeed, even more likely that it is wholly genuine.

ZLOTNIK (2739), in an article marked by gross errors, contends, largely on the basis of the 'Testimonium Flavianum', that Josephus was not a Pharisee but a Jewish Christian, and indeed terms Bannus, the hermit with whom Josephus associated for three years, a Jewish Christian. We may comment that it is not likely that a Christian would have restricted his mention of Jesus to a single short reference (Ant. 18. 63–64) in a long work and to a brief cross-reference (Ant. 20. 200).

GOLDSTEIN (2740), pp. 99–100, briefly summarizes the views regarding the authenticity of the 'Testimonium' and notes that not many in our day would regard it as authentic in its entirety.

I have not seen MEINERTZ (2740a).

SCHEIDWEILER (2741) answers MARTIN (2731), reconstructing the 'Testimonium' differently, though agreeing that it contains interpolations. He (2742) follows EISLER in asserting that the original text was hostile to Jesus and that it was revamped by Christians. The 'Testimonium', he concludes, is a diplomatic document concerning a movement which Josephus could not completely ignore and whose language his assistant formulated according to the most precise instructions.

In a popular survey in Dutch, STELMA (2743), devoting particular attention to the 'Testimonium', follows THACKERAY in regarding the passage as essentially authentic but with some interpolations.

I have not seen SANDA (2744).

In a general survey, DUNKERLY (2745) discusses three 'riddles' – the 'Testimonium', the lack of reference to Jesus and Christianity in the 'War', and the passages pertaining to John, Jesus, and Christianity in the Slavonic version. He accepts, though without offering any new evidence, the authenticity of the 'Testimonium' and of the Slavonic version.

BLINZLER (2746) discusses EISLER's theory and concludes that the 'Testimonium' is, for the most part, authentic and that, in particular, the passage about the death of Jesus is genuine.

BARRETT (2747), pp. 190–207, states that the ‘Testimonium’ is partly interpolated.

BARNIKOL (2748), pp. 248–251, attempts to reconstruct the passage before, according to his claim, it was interpolated by Christians.

ELLER (2749), in an unreliable introductory college textbook, says, p. 233, that Josephus’ extended (*sic*) reference to Jesus in the ‘Antiquities’ may be discounted because of his later conversion to Christianity (!).

BAUER (2750), pp. 324–325, in a brief note, concludes that the ‘Testimonium’ is either fully or very thoroughly transformed by a Christian hand, but that the more daring the attempt to restore the original Greek text the more incredible it is.

CONZELMANN (2751), p. 622, says that the passage reflects the Lucan *kerygma* and that it was interpolated as a whole into Josephus’ text.

DULIÈRE (2752), pp. 197–211, noting that there are forty-one people bearing the name of Jesus in the Septuagint, the New Testament, and Josephus (twenty-one in the last), to which we should add those bearing the name Joshua in Hebrew texts, raises the question which Jesus is referred to in any given passage. We may reply, however, by asserting that, despite the frequency of the name, there are too details in our ‘Testimonium’ to allow for any doubt that it is the Jesus of Nazareth of the Gospels that is meant.

MÚNERA (2753) briefly argues that the ‘Testimonium’ is authentic.

SHUTT (2754), p. 121, after studying Josephus’ language, concludes that the ‘Testimonium’, as Josephus wrote it, was probably long enough to arouse suspicion but not long enough or bitter enough to win commendation from the Jews.

HAHN (2755), pp. 18–19, decides against the genuineness of the passage as we have it and favors the theory of interpolation.

MANSON (2756), pp. 18–19, says that the passage was partly interpolated; he follows Jerome’s reading in asserting that the passage originally read “He was considered to be the Messiah”.

MARTINI (2757) follows MARTIN (2731) in postulating that the text has been partly interpolated with two or three marginal glosses from a Christian hand and suggests, though with no evidence, that these were originally by Origen in his ‘corrections’ of Josephus.

FILSON (2758), pp. 67–68, asserts that the passage is at least partially interpolated and suggests that perhaps the entire paragraph is the work of a Christian scribe.

PELLETIER (2759)(2760), following REINACH (2761), says that the ‘Testimonium’ is basically authentic, that Josephus may have had access to an early Christian confession and recorded some of its phrases, and that Josephus’ remark about the attachment of the Christians to their master fits in with Josephus’ statement about his attachment to Bannus in the wilderness (Life 11–12) and gives an air of authenticity to the piece. However, the phrases “if it is fitting to call him a man” and “he was the Messiah” seem to have originated as a marginal gloss, perhaps from an early fourth-century polemicist (one is tempted to think of Eusebius, as ZEITLIN has suggested). We may comment that the

statement about the attachment of the Christians to their leader is very differently worded from that about Josephus' relationship to Bannus.

WILLIAMSON (2762), in a popular book marred by Christian parochial bias and near Fundamentalism, accepts the 'Testimonium' as wholly genuine.

METZGER (2763), pp. 73–76, says that the passage has been considerably expanded, if not totally interpolated, by an over-zealous Christian scribe.

BRANDON (2764), pp. 119–121, 359–368, concludes that the 'Testimonium' is partly interpolated.

COHN (2765), pp. 308–316 (English version), asserts that the passage cannot be authentic, though it is demonstrably not feasible to differentiate clearly between what stemmed from Josephus and what did not. Resorting to pure conjecture, COHN suggests that the passage originally was anti-Christian, showing how the Jews, in their loyalty to the Romans, did all that they could to nip the new movement in the bud, and praising the wise statesmanship of Pilate. Josephus, he asserts, was at pains to assign the credit for the crucifixion of Jesus to the Jews and to the Romans in equal measure, whereas the interpolators were at pains to blame the Jews and to whitewash Pilate. We may comment that there is no indication in the other incidents in the context that the Jews were in particularly harmonious accord with the Romans; on the contrary, they vigorously oppose Pilate in the passage just before the 'Testimonium', and they are expelled from Rome in the passage shortly thereafter (Ant. 18. 81–84). That Josephus did not regard Pilate as a wise statesman is clear from the two incidents immediately preceding the 'Testimonium' (Ant. 18. 55–62).

CAZELLES (2766), pp. 106–107, in a popular work, follows PELLETIER in regarding the passage as essentially authentic, with only two Christian interpolations.

WINTER (2767)(2768), noting a number of phrases not in keeping with third-century Christian notions or phraseology, regards the passage as partly interpolated and suggests that inasmuch as, in the passage immediately preceding this, Josephus gives two instances of Pilate's maladministration, this was the third in Josephus' original version; as it is, the passage blames not Pilate but the leaders of the Jews.

CRAPPS–MCKNIGHT–SMITH (2769), pp. 49–50, in a work intended for the elementary student, argues for partial interpolation.

PRÉCHAC (2770), arguing against MARTIN (2731), asks how an interpolation could have been perpetuated simultaneously in all the cities in which copies of Josephus were circulating – Rome, Alexandria, Carthage, Caesarea, etc. – and concludes that the 'Testimonium' is genuine. We may reply that, in view of the fact, noted above, that no one cites it before Eusebius and only Jerome in the century that follows, it is quite conceivable that other copies did not, indeed, have the interpolation. Inasmuch as our earliest manuscript containing this part of the 'Antiquities' dates from the eleventh century, it, together with the others, is a copy derived ultimately from the interpolated manuscript.

SPIVEY and SMITH (2771), pp. 172–173, in an introductory work, do not accept the 'Testimonium' as genuine.

KEE (2772), pp. 31–34, declares that the passage has come down to us almost as Josephus wrote it, and that he was conveying merely what Jesus' followers claimed in his behalf.

LEUTY (2773), pp. 65–72, declares, though without evidence, that Josephus must have had some knowledge of the founding fathers of Christianity but that he showed them only passing interest. He concludes that Josephus could not have written "He was the Messiah". We may comment that if Josephus paid so little attention to Christianity he was not alone: both Jewish and pagan writers ignore the movement and its founder for a full generation after the death of Jesus and give it little attention until the end of the second century.

I have not seen LOSADA (2774).

LINDESKOG (2774a), pp. 191–196, presents a brief summary of the scholarship on the 'Testimonium Flavianum' and on the Slavonic Josephus, with reference to the theories of ZEITLIN (2737).

HAINCHELIN (2774b), pp. 228–229, concludes that the whole of the 'Testimonium' is an interpolation and that section 65 naturally follows 62 in Book 18 of the 'Antiquities'.

SCHMITTLEIN (2774c), pp. 16–17, comments, very picturesquely, that the 'Testimonium' must be studied with the prudence of the serpent but also with the simplicity of the dove. He is critical of GUIGNEBERT (2774d), since the latter accepts the authenticity of the last phrase in the 'Testimonium'. This, says SCHMITTLEIN, is begging the question.

BRAUN (2774e), pp. 90–110, presents a critique of the theories of EISLER (2725).

DUNKERLEY (2774g) looks favorably upon EISLER (2725).

BIN GORION (BERDICEWSKI) (2774h), pp. 105–108, asserts that the 'Testimonium Flavianum' is interpolated, as both the subject matter and style show.

SEIDENSTICKER (2774i) concludes that the 'Testimonium' was later modified and added to by Christians.

GRANT (2774j), pp. 291–292, concludes that all we know is what Origen knew, namely, that Josephus said something about Jesus and that he spoke of him as the "so-called Christ". The wording of the 'Testimonium' is, however, especially questionable, since we know that he was militantly opposed to apocalyptic movements which, in his view, had led to the disastrous war with Rome. GRANT comments that significantly none of the three Christian passages – about Jesus, John, and James – is to be found in the parallel passages in the 'Jewish War', and concludes that presumably the Christians had become more important during the interval between the time of the composition of the 'War' and that of the 'Antiquities'.

KOCH (2774k), pp. 23–25, in a popular account, is convinced that the 'Testimonium' is falsified.

SPEICHER (2774l), pp. 113–121, in a popular account, concludes that the 'Testimonium' was completely interpolated at a late date.

TRILLING (2774m), pp. 53–56 (pp. 69–74 in the French translation), concludes that the 'Testimonium' is a Christian interpolation, and that Josephus'

silence about Jesus is due not to his animosity toward the Christians but the contrary, since the enemies of the Christians would have drawn attention to them and protected the Jews from reproach. We may comment that it is hard to believe that one favorably disposed toward the Christians would have passed over in utter silence what to the Christians is the key event in human history, the life of Jesus.

BEN-CHORIN (2774n) summarizes the theories of EISLER (2774f) and BIN GORION (2774h) concerning Josephus' evidence as to the historical Jesus.

HERRMANN (2774o) concludes that the "Testimonium" is totally interpolated, as is the John passage.

SPEYER (2774p), pp. 240–242, asserts that the "Testimonium" is a falsification, noting that Christian books, such as Hippolytus' *Contra Gentes* were ascribed to Josephus.

As to DANIEL-ROPS (2774q), ENSLIN (2774r) remarks that he is more concerned with producing a popular best seller than with such minor concerns as history and truth.

I have not seen DUBARLE (2774s) and ORY (2774t). [See *infra*, p. 957.]

BRUCE (2774u), pp. 32–41, concludes that the "Testimonium" is partly interpolated. He regards as authentic the phrases "a source of further trouble", "strange things", "so-called Christ", and "to cause trouble".

PÖTSCHER (2774v) says that the "Testimonium" was partly interpolated by a Christian who contented himself with minor modifications of a few passages, so that even the passage about Jesus' resurrection is only partly due to the Christian interpolator, and he reconstructs the passage to read "he seemed to appear to them on the third day" (which, we may comment, seems close to the Arabic version of Agapius, which PÖTSCHER does not mention). He reconstructs the original passage to read that "he won over many Jews and many of the Greeks that (ὅτι) he was the Messiah". Josephus, as a Pharisee, he says, could not have accepted Jesus as the Messiah; but, we may ask, why could he not do so, since there were many divergent beliefs concerning the nature of the Messiah that were widely current? That Josephus did not accept Jesus as the Messiah is clear, he says, from the reference to Jesus as the so-called Christ (*Ant.* 20. 200). We may, however, remark that Josephus elsewhere seems to avoid the use of the word Χριστός, even though he mentions about ten Messianic figures in the last three books of the *'Antiquities'*; the very fact that he avoids the use of the word Χριστός elsewhere but employs it here (*Ant.* 20.200), in a passage the authenticity of which has not been seriously questioned, seems significant.

I have not seen KRIJBOLDER (2774w), who deals with the "Testimonium".

BARAS (2774x) remarks that it seems illogical that Josephus would first praise Jesus and then mock him. He insightfully comments that a depreciatory reference to Jesus would have aroused Origen's indignation. He adds that the changes, for purposes of Christian historiography, made by Origen and Eusebius in the story of James' martyrdom are, therefore, not without bearing on the essentially unacceptable phrases and assertions of the "Testimonium", which itself is not necessarily derogatory, and, therefore, add doubt from another point of view to Eusebius' version of the "Testimonium".

DUBARLE (2774y) comments critically on the reconstruction of the text of the 'Testimonium' by WINTER (2768), BAMEL (2774z), and PÖTSCHER (2774v) and defends his own reconstruction of the text. He contends that Josephus had some sympathy for Jesus.

FEUILLET (2774za) says that even if we admit the authenticity of the 'Testimonium' (he believes that most, if not all of it, was written by Josephus), Josephus clearly had little direct information about Jesus. In an appendix FEUILLET offers French translations of three medieval versions and presents three modern reconstructions of Josephus' text.

COOK (2774zb) regards the 'Testimonium' as spurious.

GRANT (2774zc) concludes that the 'Testimonium' in its present form is essentially Christian. He accepts the suggestion of MARTIN (2731) that the Christian statements came from marginal notes in the manuscript used by Origen or even made by him.

I (2774zd) have an extensive critical survey of the bibliography, the manuscript tradition, the citations in Church Fathers, the context, the language (especially the phrase "he was the Messiah"), Josephus' sources, his motives for inserting the 'Testimonium', and the Arabic version. I draw the following conclusions: (1) We must start with the assumption that the 'Testimonium' is authentic until proven otherwise, inasmuch as the manuscript tradition, late though it be, is unanimous in including it; (2) the fact that Josephus speaks of Jesus in Antiquities 20. 200 in his reference to James the brother of "the aforementioned Christ", a passage the authenticity of which has been almost universally acknowledged, indicates that Jesus had been mentioned previously; (3) the fact that so many Church Fathers who knew Josephus' works do not refer to the 'Testimonium', which would have been a mighty argument in polemics against Jews especially, until Eusebius, and the fact that a century elapses before it is again referred to by Jerome is a strong argument that the passage did not exist in the form in which it presently exists; (4) Origen's statement that Josephus did not admit "Jesus to be Christ" is a strong argument that Origen did have a passage about Jesus but that it was neutral; (5) the fact that there was a passage about Jesus in the 'Antiquities' may help to explain the Talmud's silence about Josephus; (6) as Jew, Josephus might well have acknowledged someone to be the Messiah without necessarily being excluded from the Jewish fold; but since the concept of the Messiah at this time had definite political overtones of revolution and independence, Josephus, as a lackey of the Roman royal house, could hardly have recognized Jesus as such; and, indeed, Josephus avoids the use of the term 'Messiah' except here and in Antiquities 20. 200 in connection with Jesus; (7) the modified versions of the 'Testimonium' by Agapius in Arabic and by Michael in Syriac strengthen the view that the original 'Testimonium' was not in the form in which we have it; Jerome's statement that "he was believed to be the Messiah" corroborates this.

The most intriguing of these points is that the 'Testimonium' is not mentioned by Christian writers before the fourth century despite its obvious value to them. Of course, one may object that Philo is similarly unmentioned by Christian writers before the third century despite the usefulness of the Logos



theory for Christian theologians. This we may explain, however, by suggesting that serious Christian theology does not start until the third century. But then he is mentioned. Why is Josephus' 'Testimonium' not mentioned until the fourth century?

SALVADOR (2774ze), after surveying the scholarship on the 'Testimonium', concludes that it is basically authentic.

DAVIES (2774zf), pp. 64–66, commenting on the 'Testimonium' and on 'Antiquities' 20. 200, concludes that the 'Testimonium' is partly interpolated.

KLAUSNER (2774zg) concludes that the 'Testimonium' is largely the fabrication of Christian copyists dating from the third century between the time of Irenaeus and that of Eusebius, but that the statement is entirely consonant with the literary style and spirit of Josephus.

### 23.3: Josephus' Sources for the 'Testimonium Flavianum'

(2775) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.

By the time Josephus completed the 'Antiquities' in 93, the Gospel of Mark had been written and was already circulating in Rome, and that of Luke had recently been produced in Rome. There are other parallels between Luke and Josephus, and, as we shall see, the question has often been raised as to whether either knew the other's writings. Of course, Josephus might have learned about the Christians in Jerusalem, where he had been born not long after the crucifixion of Jesus; and, moreover, he had been in Rome in 64 in the year of the great fire which Nero had blamed on the Christians.

THACKERAY (2775), p. 128, notes that Christianity had been gaining adherents at the court of Josephus' patron, the Emperor Domitian, among members (a niece and a cousin) of his own family. The persecution of the Christians understandably had created a stir which may have led Josephus to include a mention of the group. But, we may add, Josephus did not apparently regard the Christians as a 'sect' of importance comparable to the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Fourth Philosophy, since he does not mention them in his catalogues of such sects.

Both Justin Martyr and Tertullian, who wrote in the second and third centuries, assumed that there was an account of Jesus' trial in the Roman archives. In view of the Roman, and especially Tiberius', passion for bureaucratic details, we may assume that all administrators kept careful records, which eventually must have been retained in Rome at the court. Inasmuch as Josephus had easy access to the court, we may assume that he was able to consult these records.

### 23.4: Josephus' Motives for Inserting the 'Testimonium'

(2776) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Giessen 1920.

- (2777) FRANCIS C. BURKITT: Josephus and Christ. In: *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 47, 1913, pp. 135–144.
- (2778) JOSEPH W. SWAIN: Supplementary remarks. In: JAMES T. SHOTWELL, *The History of History*. Vol. 1. New York 1939. Pp. 151–154.
- (2779) JOSEPH SPENCER KENNARD, JR.: Gleanings from the Slavonic Josephus Controversy. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 161–170.
- (2780) ETHELBERT STAUFFER: *Der Hofprophet mit dem Alten Testament*. In his: *Christus und die Caesaren*. Historische Skizzen. 5th ed., Hamburg 1960. Trans. into English by K. and R. GREGOR SMITH: *Christ and the Caesars*. London 1955.

What motives, if any, can we establish for Josephus' insertion of a passage about Jesus? LAQUEUR (2776) presents a theory that Justus of Tiberias had charged that Josephus had misinterpreted the Bible and had taken the Septuagint as his basis, whereas by the end of the century a movement against the Septuagint was becoming strong in the rabbinical schools. In his desperation Josephus, the old fox who had alienated the Jews politically by his behavior in the war against Rome and who had offended them religiously by his use of the Septuagint, now turned to the Christians and inserted the 'Testimonium' to gain this small and devoted market, since for them the Septuagint was divinely inspired. In this theory LAQUEUR had been anticipated by BURKITT (2777).

SWAIN (2778) admires but rejects what he calls this brilliant hypothesis. We may object that there is no evidence that Justus had, indeed, charged Josephus with misinterpreting the Bible, and that since Domitian persecuted the Christians it would hardly have been politic for Josephus to seek to please them. LAQUEUR would have us believe that Josephus sought to sell copies to Christians, but there is no evidence that he needed any money, since, despite LAQUEUR, we have no reason to believe that he had lost his comfortable pension and excellent living quarters under royal protection. We may ask, furthermore, why, if Josephus appended the work 'Against Apion' to please the Jews he should have risked offending them by inserting the 'Testimonium'. Again, Josephus' Jewish readers were Greek-speaking and continued to look to the Septuagint and would certainly not have objected to his use of the Greek Bible. Finally, Josephus frequently deviates from the Septuagint where he has a different Biblical tradition.

KENNARD (2779) suggests that there might well have been interest in a movement whose followers had been accused by Nero of setting fire to Rome and which had won followers in the Imperial court of Domitian. Josephus himself, he says, may have removed mention of Jesus from subsequent Greek editions in order to tone down the Messianism, which would displease his Roman patrons; but, we may comment, while it is true that some scholars, as noted above, find evidence of two editions of the 'Antiquities', there is no evidence that there were any changes made in the text of the 'Testimonium'. In addition, we may ask why he should have sought to tone down the Messianism since there was no revolt immediately pending at the time when he wrote the 'Antiquities'.

STAUFFER (2780), pp. 155–159, presents a theory, utterly without evidence, that is, in effect, opposed to LAQUEUR's, namely that Josephus was probably the prattler who sought to destroy Christianity through tendentious

remarks and thus to throw upon the Christians the hatred that had previously been focussed on the Jews.

### 23.5: The "Testimonium Flavianum": "He Was the Messiah"

- (2781) LUCAS OSIANDER: *Epitomes historiae ecclesiasticae* centuria I, II, III. 9 parts. Tübingen 1592–1604.
- (2782) TANAQUIL FABER (TANNEGUI LE FÈVRE) (LEFÈBRE): *Flavii Josephi de Jesu Domino testimonium suppositum esse diatriba*. Saumur 1655.
- (2783) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden 1968.
- (2784) PIERRE DANIEL HUETIUS (HUET): *Demonstratio Evangelica ad serenissimum Delphinum*. Paris 1679; Amsterdam 1680; Paris 1690; Leipzig 1694; Frankfurt 1722.
- (2785) TOBIAS ECKHARD(us): *Non-Christianorum de Christo testimonia, oder Zeugnisse von Christo derer die doch nicht Christen gewesen seyn, ex antiquis monumentis proposita et diiudicata*. Quedlinburg 1725; 2nd ed., 1736.
- (2786) ROBERT FINDLAY: *A Vindication of the Sacred Books and of Josephus, especially the former, from various misrepresentations and cavils of the celebrated M. de Voltaire*. Glasgow 1770.
- (2787) HENRI DANIEL-ROPS: *Jésus en son temps*. Paris 1945. Trans. into English by RUBY MILLAR: *Jesus and His Times*. New York 1954.
- (2788) FELIX SCHEIDWEILER: *Das Testimonium Flavianum*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 45, 1954, pp. 230–243.
- (2789) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Testimonium Flavianum*. In: *History Today* 19, 1969, p. 438.
- (2790) FRANZ DORNSEIFF: *Zum Testimonium Flavianum*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 46, 1955, pp. 245–250.
- (2790a) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden 1977.
- (2790b) E. BRATKE: *Das sogenannte Religionsgespräch am Hof der Sasaniden*. Leipzig 1899.
- (2790c) A. FEUILLET: *Les anciens historiens profanes et la connaissance de Jésus*. In: *Esprit et Vie* 87, 1977, pp. 145–153.
- (2790d) DAVID HILL: *Jesus and Josephus' 'Messianic Prophets'*. In: ERNEST BEST and R. McL. WILSON, edd., *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black*. Cambridge 1979. Pp. 143–154.

Ever since OSIANDER (2781), cent. 1, lib. 2, cap. 7, p. 17 (and not FABER [2782], as SCHRECKENBERG [2783], p. 23, would have it) first declared the "Testimonium" to be forged on the ground that if Josephus had written it he would have been a Christian, which he is not in any of his writings, the passage has been vehemently attacked and just as vehemently defended, with many attempting to find middle ground. Among the more important of pre-nineteenth century defenses of the passage's authenticity we may cite HUETIUS (2784), pp. 27–32 (2nd ed., pp. 45–52), and ECKHARD(us) (2785), pp. 88–99 (2nd ed. pp. 133–147). Among the more famous rejections of the passage's authenticity we may mention VOLTAIRE, as cited by FINDLAY (2786), pp. 527–587.

The principal argument against genuineness is that Josephus, as a loyal Pharisaic Jew, could not have written that Jesus was the Messiah, since this would have made him a Christian. Some have tried to use the references to Jesus in the Slavonic Josephus as evidence of Josephus' attitude toward Christianity, but this

is questionable, we may remark, since the authenticity of this version is highly disputed. Inasmuch as Josephus nowhere else (except Ant. 20. 200, where he again refers to Jesus) uses the word Χριστός and, in fact, as we have noted above, repeatedly suppresses the Messianic aspects of the revolt against Rome because of the association of the Messiah with political revolt and independence, it would seem hard to believe that Josephus would openly call Jesus a Messiah.

DANIEL-ROPS (2787), pp. 12–15, remarks that as a Jew writing for a Roman public a work to defend his people, Josephus would hardly seek to offend his Roman masters.

SCHEIDWEILER (2788) suggests that the passage originally read ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός, just as it appears in Antiquities 20. 200, when he is referred to in the account of the death of James, the brother of Jesus. The fact, we may comment, that Jerome (De Viris Illustribus 13) in his quotation of Antiquities 18. 63 reads *credebatur esse Christus* would seem to indicate that Jerome's Greek text read "he was believed to be the Messiah" rather than "he was the Messiah".

BRANDON (2789) goes further and declares that Josephus recognized the Emperor Vespasian as the predicted world-ruler, i.e. as the Messiah, who would come forth from Judea, and hence could not also have called Jesus the Messiah. We may remark that Josephus did not regard Vespasian as the Messiah but merely, through the gift of prophecy, foretold his accession. He could hardly have ascribed Messiahship to a non-Jew, since the prevalent Jewish tradition viewed the Messiah as a descendant of King David and hence Jewish.

DORNSEIFF (2790) argues that the statement that Jesus was the Messiah does not make of Josephus a Christian since many in his day called themselves Messiahs. We may, indeed, add that Rabbi Akiva recognized Bar Kochba as the Messiah in the revolt of 132–135, an ascription in which he was opposed by others, and yet was not read out of the Jewish fold. Moreover, if a Christian had interpolated the "Testimonium" he would probably have written, "This is the Christ", not "This was the Christ". DORNSEIFF suggests that Josephus looked upon Jesus merely as a wonder-worker rather than as Christ; but, we may comment, in view of the usage of the word in the Septuagint, it is hard to believe that it would not be understood in the sense of "anointed", and hence as the King Messiah.

SCHRECKENBERG (2790a) notes that Pseudo-Anastasios Sinaites in the sixth century, as cited by BRATKE (2790b), has a shortened form of the "Testimonium" which does not say that Josephus called Jesus the Christ. SCHRECKENBERG suggests that Pseudo-Anastasios' text does not go back to that of Eusebius but perhaps to Philip of Sidon of the fifth century.

FEUILLET (2790c) remarks that the phrase "he was the Messiah" does not have the Christian significance which we attribute to it today and that all that is meant is that Jesus was another one of the Messiahs of the day. We may, however, suggest that the very fact that Josephus nowhere else applies the word Χριστός to the Messiah-like figures is significant.

I have not seen HILL (2790d). [See *infra*, p. 958.]

### 23.6: The 'Testimonium Flavianum', Origen, and Eusebius

- (2791) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (2792) CH. MARTIN: Le 'testimonium flavianum'. Vers une solution définitive? In: *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 20, 1941, pp. 409–465.
- (2793) ISTVÁN K. HORVÁTH: Egy Origenes-helyi problematikájához (= On the Problem of a Passage in Origen). In: *Antik Tanulmányok – Studia Antiqua* 9, 1962, pp. 92–96.
- (2794) LOUIS PRÉCHAC: Réflexions sur le 'Testimonium Flavianum'. In: *Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé*, 1969, pp. 101–111.
- (2795) DAVID S. WALLACE-HADRILL: Eusebius of Caesarea and the *Testimonium Flavianum* (Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII. 63f.). In: *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 25, 1974, pp. 353–362.

A second argument against the authenticity of the 'Testimonium' is that a considerable number of Christian writers – Pseudo-Justin and Theophilus in the second century, Minucius Felix, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Julius Africanus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Origen in the third century, and Methodius and Pseudo-Eustathius in the early fourth century – who knew Josephus and cited from his works do not refer to this passage, though one would imagine that it would be the first passage that a Christian apologist would cite. Origen (*Contra Celsum* 1. 47 and *Commentary on Matthew* 13. 55), who certainly knew Book 18 of the 'Antiquities' and cites five passages from it, explicitly states (ca. 245) that "the wonder is that though he did not admit our Jesus to be Christ he nonetheless gave witness to so much righteousness in James"; and again he clearly states that "he [Josephus] disbelieved in Jesus as Christ". It is not until ca. 324 that Eusebius cites the 'Testimonium' (on three occasions). Even after him, we may note, Basil, Ambrose, and Josippus in the fourth century, and Vegetius, Panodorus, John Chrysostom, Rufinus, Orosius, Philostorgius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Augustine in the fifth century often cite Josephus but not the 'Testimonium'; and, in fact, in the early fifth century only Jerome does so.

THACKERAY (2791), p. 130, who admits that Christian scribes have left their mark in occasional marginal glosses in our extant manuscripts, asserts, nevertheless, that it is illogical to argue that the Christians preserved Josephus' works largely on account of the 'Testimonium' and at the same time to say that they themselves interpolated it. We may reply that Josephus' 'Antiquities' was preserved by his Roman patrons, who honored it with a place in the public library (Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3. 9) until perhaps the Christians interpolated it.

MARTIN (2792) suggests, though without conclusive evidence, that Origen may have been the author of marginal glosses and that Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 1. 11. 7–8 and *Demonstratio Evangelica* 3. 5. 105), who mentions the passage as we have it, discovered and perhaps wrote it.

HORVÁTH (2793) properly remarks that it makes no sense for Origen to express wonder that Josephus did not admit Jesus to be the Messiah if he did not even mention him.

PRÉCHAC (2794) suggests that Origen is citing from memory; but inasmuch as he cites accurately some other passages from Book 18 in this context, this seems unlikely. Again, we may ask why Origen would say that Josephus did not believe that Jesus was the Messiah.

WALLACE-HADRILL (2795) disagrees with EISLER's view that Eusebius had before him a Josephan text of the type that he says was the basis of the Slavonic version. For the 'War', says WALLACE-HADRILL, Eusebius follows MSS. YRC rather than PAM. Analyzing the text of the 'Testimonium' as it appears variously in Eusebius (*Demonstratio Evangelica* 3. 5. 105–106, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1. 11. 7, and [the Syriac] *Theophania* 5. 44), he concludes that Eusebius used different copies of Josephus at various times and that the copies that he used represented different stages of assimilation. He concludes that it is exceedingly improbable that Eusebius himself was responsible for the alteration of Josephus' text, stressing that if so we would have to explain why he quoted his own interpolation differently on three separate occasions. The Josephan text, he finds, had already been Christianized and may well have seemed to him no more offensive than a Jew's hesitant reference to Jesus when writing for other non-Christians, Jewish or pagan. We may comment, however, that there are many parallels that may be cited as to varieties in self-quotation in antiquity.

### 23.7: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': the Context

- (2796) EDUARD NORDEN: Josephus und Tacitus über Jesus Christus und eine messianische Prophetie. In: *Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur* 16, 1913, pp. 637–666. Rpt. in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed., *Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84)*. Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 27–69.
- (2797) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (2798) JACQUES MOREAU: *Les plus anciens témoignages profanes sur Jésus*. Brüssel 1944.
- (2799) ISTVÁN K. HORVÁTH: Egy Origenes-helyi problematikájához (= On the Problem of a Passage in Origen). In: *Antik Tanulmányok – Studia Antiqua* 9, 1962, pp. 92–96.
- (2800) ERNST BAMMEL: Zum Testimonium Flavianum (Jos. Ant. 18, 63–64). In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 9–22.
- (2800a) ALBERT A. BELL, JR.: Josephus the Satirist? A Clue to the Original Form of the *Testimonium Flavianum*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 67, 1976, pp. 16–22.
- (2800b) CLYDE PHARR: The Testimony of Josephus to Christianity. In: *American Journal of Philology* 48, 1927, pp. 137–147.

A third objection to the authenticity of the passage is that it breaks the continuity of the narrative, which tells of a series of riots. Section 65 seems to belong directly after 62. Prior to the 'Testimonium', as NORDEN (2796), THACKERAY (2797), p. 140, and MOREAU (2798) have noted, we have a description of two riots, and after the 'Testimonium' we have two others, all of them termed *θόρυβοι*, whereas in sections 63–64 the Christian movement is not called a *θόρυβος*. THACKERAY has ingeniously noted, however, that the phrase

γίνεται δέ, which introduces the 'Testimonium', invariably introduces a calamity in Josephus, and that perhaps the phrase that followed was "the beginning of new disturbances".

As HORVÁTH (2799) and others have noted, in view of the fact that the 'Testimonium' is in immediate juxtaposition to the story of the priestess of Isis who was seduced by her lover, it is possible that the original version of the 'Testimonium' told how Mary became pregnant by a soldier Panthera, a version alluded to in Celsus and in the medieval 'Toledoth Yeshu' and answered by Origen (*Contra Celsum* 1. 32).

BAMMEL (2800) notes the parallel with the Samaritan episode (*Ant.* 18. 85–87) that follows not long afterwards, and suggests that the original of the 'Testimonium' was pejorative, thus representing the oldest literary denunciation of Jesus.

The Codex of Justinian imposed the death penalty for the possession of works which described Jesus as a "magician", "agitator", or "revolutionary". We may guess that there would have been no need for such a prohibition if there were not such works in existence. One of these may have been the 'Toledoth Yeshu', another perhaps the original of the 'Testimonium'.

BELL (2800a) notes that Hegesippus' treatment of the Paulina-Mundus story (*Ant.* 18. 65–80) in *De excidio Hierosolymitanæ Urbis* 2. 12. 1 is a parody of the annunciation (*Luke* 1. 26–38) and lends support to the theory of PHARR (2800b) that the original 'Testimonium' contained a derogatory account of the manner of Jesus' birth, inasmuch as, in the Paulina-Mundus story which follows, there is a similar motif of a woman being tricked into having relations with a man posing as a god. BELL says that it would not be surprising, in view of his intimacy with Constantine, if Eusebius rewrote the passage as part of imperial policy. He adds that the episode (*Ant.* 18. 81–84) of the Jewish teacher who diverted to his own use Fulvia's donation to the Temple may be a satire on Paul, whose converts included large numbers of women, though, we may comment, there is no indication or even accusation that Paul did anything of this sort.

### 23.8: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': Its Language

- (2801) FELIX SCHEIDWEILER: *Das Testimonium Flavianum*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 45, 1954, pp. 230–243.
- (2802) FRANZ DORNSEIFF: *Zum Testimonium Flavianum*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 46, 1955, pp. 245–250.
- (2803) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (2804) THOMAS W. MANSON: *The Life of Jesus. A Study of the Available Materials*. 1943. In: THOMAS W. MANSON, *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, ed. by MATTHEW BLACK. Manchester 1962. Pp. 13–27.
- (2805) JOSEPH SPENCER KENNARD, JR.: *Gleanings from the Slavonic Josephus Controversy*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 161–170.
- (2806) JACQUES MOREAU: *Les plus anciens témoignages profanes sur Jésus*. Brüssel 1944.

- (2807) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Hoax of the 'Slavonic Josephus'. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 171–180.
- (2808) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Rise and Fall of the Judaean State: A Political, Social and Religious History of the Second Commonwealth. Vol. 2: 37 B.C.E. – 66 C.E. Philadelphia 1967.
- (2809) GEORGE C. RICHARDS: The Testimonium of Josephus. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 42, 1941, pp. 70–71.
- (2810) ERNST BAMEL: Zum Testimonium Flavianum (Jos. Ant. 18, 63–64). In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 9–22.

A fourth objection to the authenticity of the "Testimonium" is its language. SCHEIDWEILER (2801) dates the reworking of the passage to the second half of the third century and to the circle of the followers of the Christology of Paul of Samosata on the basis of the phrase σοφὸς ἀνὴρ. DORNEIFF (2802) replies by stating that when Josephus called Jesus σοφός he meant merely that he was important; but we must say that it is hard to support such a neutral meaning for this word during this period.

THACKERAY (2803), p. 145, thinking it unlikely that Josephus would have written that Jesus was a teacher of such people as accept the truth gladly, suggests that perhaps "truth" (τἀληθῆ) be emended to "the unusual" (τἀήθη), which, indeed, is palaeographically very close to the manuscripts; but, we may note, the word ἀήθης is not characteristic of the writer (or assistant) of this part of the 'Antiquities', occurring nowhere after Book 13. The emendation has, nevertheless, won the approval of MANSON (2804), p. 19.

Again, the phrase that Jesus "won over many Jews and many of the Greeks" would have been impossible for a Christian who knew that Jesus had insisted (Matt. 15. 24) that he had been sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. But we may reply that by the time Josephus wrote the 'Antiquities', the course of Christianity had been set by Paul to include primarily non-Jews, and attempts were made to depict Jesus' friendliness to Samaritans and others.

The fact that Eusebius, who is the first to quote the "Testimonium", cites it differently in his three works, is evidence to KENNARD (2805) that Eusebius was not the forger; but we may comment that Clement of Alexandria, for example, when he quotes, constantly varies the text.

MOREAU (2806) notes that the phrase εἰς ἔτι τε νῦν (Ant. 18. 64) is not Josephan but Eusebian and concludes that the passage is a total interpolation.

ZEITLIN (2807)(2808), who argues that the passage was written by Eusebius, points to the phrase "the tribe [φῦλον] of Christians", which is found here (Ant. 18. 64) and again, for the first time among the Church Fathers, in Eusebius. He asserts that the fact that there are variants in the three quotations of the "Testimonium" in Eusebius is due to later scribes and does not show that Eusebius was not the author. KENNARD (2805) is, however, not convinced and suggests that even though Eusebius is partial to the use of the word φῦλον, at most its use in his citations of the "Testimonium" may indicate only that the text bears the imprint of Eusebius' editing.



RICHARDS (2809), a careful student of Josephus' language, notes these and several other stylistic peculiarities indicating that the passage is authentic.

BAMMEL (2810) reads ἀπατήσαντες for ἀγαπήσαντες, deletes ἦν in ὁ χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν, and changes ἐπηγάγετο to ἀπηγάγετο. He argues that the present version, with these slight emendations of possible copying errors, can remain in its extant form, since it fits the Josephan style and attitude.

On the other hand, as THACKERAY (2803), p. 140, has noted, the phrase "such people as accept he truth gladly" (ἡδονῇ) is characteristic of the scribe in this part of the 'Antiquities', since we find the phrase eight times in Books 17–19 (supposedly the work of the Thucydidean assistant) and nowhere else in Josephus. Christian interpolation is unlikely, since the word ἡδονῇ in the New Testament and in early Christian writings has a pejorative connotation. We may conclude, however, by stating that the passage is too short to be definitive in any stylistic studies.

### 23.9: Jesus' Appearance according to the Original 'Testimonium'

- (2811) ROBERT EISLER: *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30. Trans. into English by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE: *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus' Recently Rediscovered 'Capture of Jerusalem'*. London 1931.
- (2812) JOHN P. ARENDZEN: *The Human Appearance of Christ*. In his: *Men and Manners in the Days of Christ: Studies and Character Sketches of the First Century* (reprinted from the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*). London 1928. Pp. 80–93.
- (2813) BERNARD LEEMING: *Verbal Descriptions of Christ*. In: *Irish Theological Quarterly* 22, 1955, pp. 293–312.

EISLER (2811) had theorized that Josephus had described the appearance of Jesus in the original 'Testimonium' but that this had been censored by Christians because it was unfavorable to Jesus. He says (though without any evidence) that Josephus derived his information from a police description of Jesus preserved in the Roman archives. EISLER then, with no lack of imagination, says that Josephus had described Jesus as short, hunchbacked, and frightening in appearance.

St. Andrew of Crete (c. 710 C.E.), to be sure, presents a description of Jesus which he says comes from Josephus. ARENDZEN (2812) argues that the original 'Testimonium' did contain a description of Jesus. But LEEMING (2813) correctly notes that Origen, who dealt with Celsus' charge that Jesus was small and ugly, says that it is nowhere written that Jesus was of small stature. Since Origen refers to the eighteenth book of the 'Antiquities' on several occasions, the clear implication is that Josephus did not thus describe Jesus. We may further suggest that if, indeed, Jesus was hunchbacked, this should have been enough to distinguish him; and yet, according to the 'Toledoth Yeshu', the medieval Jewish account of Jesus, Judas had to point him out, presumably because Jesus was not easily distinguished.

### 23.10: The Arabic and Syriac Versions of the 'Testimonium Flavianum'

- (2814) SHLOMO PINES: An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities: Section of Humanities). Jerusalem 1971.
- (2815) ANTOINE GUILLAUMONT: Données nouvelles sur le Testimonium Flavianum. In: Revue de l'Histoire des Religions 181, 1972, pp. 102–103.
- (2816) FAUSTO PARENTE: Alcune osservazioni sul cosiddetto *Testimonium Flavianum* (Ios. Fl. ant. 18, 63–64) a proposito di un libro recente. In: Rivista di Filologia e di istruzione classica 101, 1973, pp. 125–137.
- (2817) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: Le témoignage de Josèphe sur Jésus d'après la tradition indirecte. In: Revue Biblique 80, 1973, pp. 481–513.
- (2818) ERNST BAMMEL: A New Variant Form of the *Testimonium Flavianum*. In: Expository Times 85, 1974, pp. 145–147.
- (2818a) GUY FAU: La preuve par Agapius. In: Bulletin Ernst Rénan 20. 171, 1972, pp. 5–7.
- (2818b) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus. Leiden 1977.
- (2818c) MORTON SMITH, rev.: SHLOMO PINES, An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 91, 1972, pp. 441–442.
- (2818d) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: Le témoignage de l'historien Josèpos sur Jésus dans la tradition syriaque (arab.). In: Bayn al-Naharayn 2, Bagdad 1974, pp. 77–92.
- (2818e) ANDRÉ.-M. DUBARLE: Le témoignage de Josèphe sur Jésus d'après des publications récentes. In: Revue Biblique 84, 1977, pp. 38–58.
- (2818f) A. FEUILLET: Les anciens historiens profanes et la connaissance de Jésus. In: Esprit et Vie 87, 1977, pp. 145–153.
- (2818g) PIERRE GEOLTRAIN: Débat récent autour du 'Testimonium Flavianum'. In: Revue de l'Histoire des Religions 185, 1974, pp. 112–114.
- (2818h) JEAN DANIELLOU: Flavius Josèphe: Qu'a-t-il écrit sur Jésus? In: Les Dossiers de l'Archéologie, no. 10, 1975, pp. 56–57.
- (2818i) JOHANN MAIER: Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung. Darmstadt 1978.
- (2818j) DAVID FLUSSER: The Evidence of Josephus on Jesus (in Hebrew). In his: Jewish Sources in Early Christianity: Studies and Essays. Tel-Aviv 1979. Pp. 72–80.
- (2818k) P. W. VAN DER HORST: Jezus in de joodse literatuur van de oudheid. In: Kerk en Theologie 30, 1979, pp. 105–114.
- (2818l) PIERRE PRIGENT: Thallos, Phlégon et le Testimonium Flavianum. Témoins de Jésus? In: Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme. Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique: mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon. Paris 1978. Pp. 329–334.

A considerable stir was created when PINES (2814) brought to the scholarly world's attention two hitherto almost completely neglected works containing the 'Testimonium', one a tenth-century history of the world in Arabic by a Christian named Agapius and the other a twelfth-century chronicle in Syriac by Michael the Syrian. Agapius does not have "if indeed we ought to call him a man", he omits reference to Jesus' miracles, he omits completely the role of the Jewish leaders in accusing Jesus, he states not that Jesus appeared to his disciples on the third day but that his disciples reported this, and most important he states (at the end rather in the middle of the passage) that "he was perhaps the Messiah" rather than that he was the Messiah. Michael's version is closer to the Greek, but he says "he was thought to be the Messiah". PINES suggests that Agapius' version is the product of Christian censorship applied to the original

text in a less thoroughgoing form than in the case of the vulgate recension. We may comment that if it is unlikely that Josephus declared that Jesus was the Messiah it seems hardly more likely that he would have stated that he was perhaps the Messiah; on such matters one either believes or does not believe. This may, of course, be due to the translation into Arabic; since Agapius apparently used Syriac sources, and since the Syriac tradition, as seen in the later chronicle of Michael, has "he was thought to be the Messiah" (as indeed we find in Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 13), the original may well have read thus. We may suggest that a clue to the interpretation of Agapius may be found in what follows: "This is what is said by Josephus and his companions". Apparently Agapius used not only Josephus but other sources as well and presumably combined them. That this is so may be seen from the fact that he proceeds to state that, according to Josephus, Herod burnt the genealogies of the tribes in order that it should not be known that he was descended from undistinguished people – a fact that is not found in Josephus but is found in Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1. 7. 13. In fact, PINES himself, pp. 54–63, notes the relatively close correspondence between Agapius and Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1. 10. 2–6; and it seems likely, as PINES himself admits, that Agapius derived his information not from Josephus directly but from a recension of Eusebius, and that the relatively minor divergences between them are due to the process of translation and paraphrase. As a believing Christian, Agapius would surely not have eliminated the passages about Jesus' superhuman nature, and hence we may assume that he is reproducing what he found. PINES leaves open the question whether Agapius' text is in the form in which Josephus originally wrote it or whether it had already been doctored by Christian copyists. We may, however, conclude that Agapius' excerpt is hardly decisive, since it contains several elements, notably changes in order, that indicate that it is a paraphrase rather than a translation.

GUILLAUMONT (2815) asserts that PINES' work is striking confirmation of the authenticity of the "Testimonium". He is not, however, convinced by PINES' argument tracing back Agapius' version to Eusebius' 'Ecclesiastical History'. Moreover, the study of the Syriac sources utilized by Agapius remains to be made.

I have not seen PARENTE (2816).

DUBARLE (2817) compares Agapius and Michael with George Kedrenos, who probably lived at the end of the eleventh and at the beginning of the twelfth century, as well as with the Chronicle of Pseudo-Simeon Magister (Ms. Parisinus 1712, Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, fol. 76'), George Hamartolos ('George the Monk'), and other Byzantine chronicles; and he notes many similarities as against the received text of the "Testimonium". He explains these by assuming that they depend actually on Eusebius. On this basis, as well as through other indirect witnesses of the passage, he reconstructs the original "Testimonium", with the crucial passage reading: "People thought that he was the Messiah". He says that Josephus could well be responsible for every element in such a relatively favorable description of Jesus. We may add that the accusing finger again seems to point in the direction of Eusebius as the one responsible

for 'adjusting' the text. Eusebius, we may recall, quotes the 'Testimonium' in three slightly different forms, and we may suspect that there was still a fourth form, namely the one which he found in the received text of Josephus.

BAMMEL (2818) suggests that the changes in Agapius' version indicate that it originated in an Islamic environment rather than in an earlier one. He suggests that Agapius' new features were introduced at a period of debate, partly as a result of Agapius' own epitomizing activities. As to why the author did not include Jewish participation in the accusation of Jesus, he suggests that this was unnecessary because he had supplied the information in the two neighboring accounts. We may comment that PINES has shown that Agapius used (Christian) Syriac rather than Arabic sources; and, in any case, it seems hard to believe that, as a Christian, Agapius or his Christian source (which ultimately seems to have been Eusebius) would have edited the text to make it more palatable to Moslem readers.

FAU (2818a) argues that the reference to Jesus in Agapius is worthless. We may answer his objection that the weak form cannot be anterior to the strong form by remarking that interpolation can go in either direction, dependent only upon the needs of the interpolator.

SCHRECKENBERG (2818b), pp. 9–12, adopting the position expressed by SMITH (2818c), says that Agapius sought to avoid the appearance of gross falsification, that the statement "perhaps he was the Messiah" is impossible, and that the value of PINES' work is that it makes more probable the old conjecture that the 'Testimonium' once had a genuine but negative, or, at best, indifferent, statement about Jesus. SMITH finds it difficult to believe that Josephus could ever have written "perhaps he was the Messiah", as we find in Agapius. This is, however, we may suggest, resolved when we realize that in Michael the Syrian's version the word *mistavra* is used, meaning "thought to be", "seemed to be", or "perhaps". Agapius' version may simply be a less than literal translation of this word. This is similar, we may add, to Josephus' reference to Jesus as λεγόμενος (Ant. 2.0200) and to Jerome's *credebatur*, "he was believed" (to be the Messiah).

I have not seen DUBARLE (2818d).

DUBARLE (2818e) notes the importance of the indirect tradition as seen in the Arabic Agapius. He explains the omission of "if indeed we ought to call him a man" by noting that Agapius lived in a region where a sharp struggle raged between the Jacobites, who were Monophysite Christians, who believed that Jesus was simply G-d, and the Melekites, who insisted that Jesus was both man and G-d. Though he was a Melekite, Agapius diplomatically sought to avoid offense to the Jacobites and thus made his omission. We may comment that in view of the *odium theologicum* characteristic of this era, it seems hard to believe that Agapius would have made such an emendation for 'diplomatic' reasons. Moreover, as PINES has pointed out, Agapius is not given to theological and political considerations in the rest of his history. In a postscript, DUBARLE comments on the article by FEUILLET (2818f) and on a new Arabic witness in the Kitāb al-Kāfi of Gerasime (thirteenth century), which omits "master of those

who receive the truth gladly”, though DUBARLE admits that the changes may be due to the negligence of the copyist.

GEOLTRAIN (2818g) concludes that Agapius’ Arabic version of the ‘Testimonium’ does not give us historic evidence regarding Jesus and that Agapius merely rendered reasonable an unreasonable piece of evidence.

DANIÉLOU (2818h) asserts that PINES’ hypothesis has some serious arguments in its favor and is very reasonable because Agapius’ version is different in precisely those parts that Josephus as a Jew would not have written as they appear in our Greek text.

MAIER (2818i), pp. 42–45, presents a review of PINES (2814) and BAMMEL (2818).

FLUSSER (2818j) concludes that Eusebius found in the library of Origen in Caesarea the original text of the ‘Testimonium’, which he changed to make it closer to the official Christian version so as to remove from himself the charge of heresy. Eusebius based his changes on the Syrian version of Church history. He concludes that the Arabic text is evidence of a prior passage of Josephus pertaining to Jesus and that the Christian falsification made changes in converting the Jewish text of Josephus to a Christian text.

I have been unable to read VAN DER HORST (2818k), who surveys several recent publications dealing with Jesus, among them PINES (2814).

PRIGENT (2818l), commenting on the ‘Testimonium’ in Agapius and Michael the Syrian, suggests that their text makes the ‘Testimonium’ more credible and that perhaps Josephus’ text was still less ‘Christianized’.

### 23.11: Jesus Son of Ananias

(2818m) FERDINAND HAHN: *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (based on diss., Heidelberg: Anfänge christologischer Traditionen). Göttingen 1963. Trans. into English by HAROLD KNIGHT and GEORGE OGG: *The Titles of Jesus in Christology; their history in early Christianity* (somewhat abridged). London 1969.

(2818n) EMANUEL BIN GORION: *Josephus and Jesus* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1973.

(2818o) BENT NOACK: *Jesus Ananiassøn og Jesus fra Nasaret. En drøftelse af Josefus, Bellum Judaicum VI, 5, 3.* Copenhagen 1975.

HAHN (2818m), pp. 352–353, comments on Jesus the son of Ananias (War 6. 300–309).

BIN GORION (2818n) comments on the thesis that War 6. 300–309 is speaking about the real Jesus unconcealed by the legend. This is not the announcer of a new teaching or the originator of a religious group but a simple man of the people who had proclaimed the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans and the fall of the Second Temple.

I have not been able to read NOACK (2818o), who is concerned with the prophecy of the destruction of the Temple by Jesus son of Ananias (War 6. 300).

## 23.12: Josephus on James

- (2819) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (2820) JACQUES MOREAU: *Les plus anciens témoignages profanes sur Jésus*. Brüssel 1944.
- (2821) MAURICE GOGUEL: *La naissance du Christianisme*. Paris 1946.
- (2822) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity*. London 1951; 2nd ed., 1957.
- (2823) JOSEF BLINZLER: *Der Prozess Jesu. Das jüdische und das römische Gerichtsverfahren gegen Jesus auf Grund der ältesten Zeugnisse*. Regensburg 1955. Trans. (of 2nd ed.) into English by ISABEL and FLORENCE MCHUGH: *The Trial of Jesus. The Jewish and Roman Proceedings against Jesus Christ Described and Assessed from the Oldest Accounts*. Westminster, Maryland 1959. Trans. into Spanish: Barcelona 1959. Trans. into French by G. DAUBIÉ: *Le procès de Jésus*. Tours 1962. Trans. into Swedish: Stockholm 1962. Trans. into Italian by COLAO PELLIZZARI: *Il processo di Gesù*. Brescia 1966.
- (2824) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Trial of Jesus*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 53, 1962–63, pp. 77–88.
- (2825) PAUL WINTER: *Josephus on Jesus*. In: *Journal of Historical Studies* 1, 1968, pp. 289–302.
- (2825a) T. NICKLIN and R. O. P. TAYLOR: *James, the Lord's Brother*. In: *Church Quarterly Review* 147, 1948, pp. 46–63.
- (2825b) HANS-J. SCHOEPS: *Aus frühchristlicher Zeit. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Tübingen 1950.
- (2825c) GEORGE D. KILPATRICK: *The Trial of Jesus*. London 1953.
- (2825d) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Death of James the Just: A New Interpretation*. In: *Festschrift Gershom Scholem. Jerusalem 1967*. Pp. 57–69.
- (2825e) DOUGLAS R. A. HARE: *The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel according to St. Matthew*. Cambridge 1967.
- (2825f) JACK FINEGAN: *Hidden Records of the Life of Jesus; an introduction to the New Testament Apocrypha and to some of the areas through which they were transmitted, namely, Jewish, Egyptian, and Gnostic Christianity, together with the earlier Gospel-type records in the Apocrypha, in Greek and Latin texts, translations and explanations*. Philadelphia and Boston 1969.
- (2825g) JOSEF BLINZLER: *The Jewish Punishment of Stoning in the New Testament Period*. In: *Festschrift C. F. D. Moule*. London 1970. Pp. 147–161.
- (2825h) DAVID R. CATCHPOLE: *The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial*. In: *Festschrift C. F. D. Moule*. London 1970. Pp. 47–65.
- (2825i) ROBERT GIROD, trans. and ed., *Origène, Commentaire sur l'Évangile selon Matthieu*, vol. 1. Paris 1970.
- (2825j) ZVI BARAS: *Testimonium Flavianum: The State of Recent Scholarship*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8)*. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 303–313, 378–385.
- (2825k) LÉON HERRMANN: *Chrestos. Témoignages païens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle*. Bruxelles 1970.
- (2825l) DAVID R. CATCHPOLE: *The Trial of Jesus; a study in the Gospels and Jewish historiography from 1770 to the present day (based on the author's thesis, Cambridge 1968)*. Leiden 1971.
- (2825m) MORTON SMITH: *Early Christianity and Judaism*. In: S. WAGNER and A. BRECK, edd., *Great Confrontations in Jewish History (University of Denver, the J. M. Goodstein Lectures on Judaica, 1975)*. Denver 1977, Pp. 39–61.

- (2825n) ROBERT M. GRANT: Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews. In: Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers, vol. 2, ed. PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 69–86.
- (2825o) WILLIAM D. DAVIES: Invitation to the New Testament: A Guide to Its Main Witnesses. London 1967.
- (2825p) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: The Rise of Christianity. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 187–262, 367–373.
- (2825q) CLEMENS THOMA: Christliche Theologie des Judentums. Aschaffenburg 1978.

Almost all scholars have accepted as authentic Josephus' reference (Ant. 20. 200) to James, "the brother of Jesus who was called the Christ" (τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ). If it had been a Christian interpolation, it would, in all probability, have been more laudatory of James. As THACKERAY (2819), p. 133, has remarked, the language and tone, especially the caustic reference to the heartlessness of the Sadducees (Ant. 20. 199), are thoroughly Josephan. The fact that the high priest Ananus is here called rash and daring and that in the Life 193ff. he is said to have been bribed to vote for Josephus' removal from his command in Galilee, whereas in the War 4. 319–320 he is eulogized, should not in itself be a cause for suspicion, since there are so many discrepancies between the 'War' and the 'Antiquities'. What is a deciding factor is that Origen had the passage in his text of Josephus, since he expresses astonishment that Josephus, who witnessed the righteousness of James (our text has no such direct encomium), should have refused to accept Jesus as the Messiah.

MOREAU (2820) regards the passage as authentic because a Christian could never have written "Jesus the so-called Christ". We may respond by noting that the phrase may mean "who was called" or "who is mentioned above".

GOGUEL (2821), pp. 144–153, says that if the account of James' death had been interpolated by a Christian, it would not have contradicted the version of Hegesippus, which was very popular in Christian circles.

BRANDON (2822) postulates that Christian censors removed Josephus' statement about James, which gave greater honor to him than to Jesus. We may comment that BRANDON's chief reason for so thinking is that Origen asserts that Josephus explained the overthrow of the Jewish nation by the Romans as G-d's revenge for the murder of the righteous James; such a passage is to be found not in Josephus but in Hegesippus, with whom Origen apparently confused Josephus, as did so many others in this period until relatively modern times. Alternatively, we may suggest that perhaps Origen connected the death of James and the fall of Jerusalem because this passage occurs in Book 20 of the 'Antiquities', which gives the background leading up to the war against the Romans.

BLINZLER (2823) asserts that the passage is definitely genuine. ZEITLIN (2824) objects, noting that Origen quotes it on three occasions, each time with some variations. We may comment that quotations in antiquity were freer and looser than they are today, as we noted in Eusebius' variations in citing the 'Testimonium'; but the important point is that though there are variations, they all agree in the key point of mentioning that James was the brother of the Christ.

WINTER (2825) notes that "called Christ" may be added merely for identification.

NICKLIN and TAYLOR (2825a) remark that Eusebius carelessly expresses himself as if he thought that our quotation from Josephus gives an account of James' death, but he shows himself to be unconscious of any contradiction between the account of Josephus and that of Hegesippus, since he quotes them both and indeed commends Hegesippus as the more accurate. Scholars have seen in the second quotation, they say, what is not there, namely an account of his death.

SCHOEPS (2825b), p. 121, comments on Hegesippus' reworking of the end of James as based upon Josephus, Eusebius, and Pseudo-Clement. He also comments, p. 148, on the passage in Origen, 'Contra Celsum', regarding James.

KILPATRICK (2825c), pp. 8–9, discusses Josephus' account of the execution of James (Ant. 20. 197–203) and expresses a preference for this account rather than for that of Hegesippus.

BRANDON (2825d) suggests that Josephus' non-committal attitude toward Jesus is due to his sympathy for Ananus, who, in Josephus' view, if he could have suppressed the Zealots, would have led the nation back to its allegiance to the Romans (War 4. 318–325). BRANDON feels that there is ground for doubting whether the text as we now have it represents what Josephus originally wrote, since Origen says that Josephus recognized the fall of Jerusalem in 70 as divine punishment for killing the righteous James. He finds it hard to believe that Origen confused Josephus and Hegesippus, since Origen actually cites the title and the particular book of the 'Antiquities' in which the Jesus passage occurs. We may remark that Josephus' attitude toward James is completely positive and hardly non-committal. As to BRANDON's idea that a Christian scribe altered both the James passage and the 'Testimonium Flavianum', we may ask why the 'Testimonium' has come down with this alteration, whereas the James passage has not. As to explaining Origen's confusion of Josephus and Hegesippus, he may have looked upon Hegesippus as so clearly dependent upon Josephus as to be for practical purposes indistinguishable from it, and in any case he may be quoting from memory, as was so often the case in antiquity in view of the difficulty of acquiring and consulting texts.

HARE (2825e), pp. 32–34, accepts the authenticity of the James passage. He also accepts the point of BRANDON (2825d) that it is unlikely that a Christian scribe, intent on making Josephus a witness to the truth of Christianity, would have been content with such a bare mention of the martyrdom. In addition, he stresses that since Origen bears witness to the fact that in his text of Josephus the righteousness of James was acknowledged, while the messiahship of Jesus was denied, the unadorned report in Josephus commands a far greater credence than does the legendary narrative of Hegesippus.

FINEGAN (2825f), pp. 47–49, deals briefly with the presentation of the death of James in Josephus and in Hegesippus.

BLINZLER (2825g) concludes that Josephus' account in Antiquities 20. 200 is worthy of credence and that Hegesippus' is legend.



CATCHPOLE (2825h), pp. 60–61, briefly discusses Josephus' account of the death of James.

GIROD (2825i), pp. 113–117, contends that Origen's version of James' martyrdom appeared in Josephus' original text. But, as BARAS (2825j) has noted, it is against Josephus' custom, which was to search for factors that would culminate in a particular event rather than to ascribe a disaster of such proportions to a crime committed against an individual. Also, as he correctly remarks, it is unlikely that the Jesus passage should have remained in Josephus' text while the story of James' martyrdom, which the Church labored to preserve, should have been excised from Josephus' writings.

HERRMANN (2825k) notes that the passage on James does not supply evidence as to terminology concerning Jesus.

CATCHPOLE (2825l), pp. 241–245, says that the alleged political complexion of the causes of James' condemnation cannot be accepted, since the accusation of having transgressed the law within the context of Pharisee-Sadducee divergences – which is how Josephus frames the incident – indicates a religious offence, and stoning confirms this. The word *πρῶτον*, he says, indicates an unjust trial and fits in with Josephus' statement about the judicial harshness of the Sadducees.

SMITH (2825m) regards it as surprising that the Pharisees got the high priest Ananus deposed because he exceeded his powers in procuring the conviction and execution of James. It is hard to believe, he says, that the Pharisees would have made an outcry about the execution of James, the leader of the Christians, unless a great change had occurred since the persecution under Agrippa I. This fits in with the statement in Acts 23. 9 that when Paul was brought before the Sanhedrin there were Pharisees who defended him.

GRANT (2825n) concludes that Hegesippus' account of the death of James is confused, since he portrays James as thrown down from the wing of the Temple, stoned, and struck on the head with a launderer's club. He notes that Eusebius, in his 'Chronicle', was not impressed by Hegesippus' account of the death of James; he knew some Christian story on the subject, but his primary source was the real Josephus. In his 'Ecclesiastical History', on the other hand, Eusebius used Origen's 'Contra Celsum' but looked up the passage in Josephus and quoted it. He was confused because he used contradictory sources – Hegesippus and Josephus.

DAVIES (2825o) notes that most scholars accept the authenticity of 'Antiquities' 20. 200.

KLAUSNER (2825p) says that there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the passage.

THOMA (2825q) comments on Antiquities 20. 197–203.

### 23.13: Josephus' Relationship to the New Testament: General

- (2826) GERHARD DELLING: *Bemerkungen zum Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*. In: *Forschungen und Fortschritte* 37, 1963, pp. 183–185.

- (2827) ALFRED WIKENHAUSER: Die Traumgesichte des Neuen Testaments in religionsgeschichtlicher Sicht. In: THEODOR KLAUSER and ADOLF RÜCKER, edd., *Pisciculi. Studien zur Religion und Kultur des Altertums*. Franz Joseph Dölger zum 60. Geburtstag dargeboten (Antike und Christentum Erg.-Bd. 1). Münster 1939. Pp. 320–333.
- (2828) ADOLF VON SCHLATTER: Der Evangelist Matthäus: seine Sprache, sein Ziel, seine Selbständigkeit. 3rd ed., Stuttgart 1948.
- (2829) JÜRGEN SCHWARK: Matthäus der Schriftgelehrte und Josephus der Priester. Ein Vergleich. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 137–154.
- (2830) HENRY J. CADBURY: The Making of Luke-Acts. New York 1927; 2nd ed., London 1958.
- (2831) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (2832) JOSEF BLINZLER: Herodes Antipas und Jesus Christus; die Stellung des Heilandes zu seinem Landesherrn. Stuttgart 1947.
- (2833) ROBERT GRAY: The Connection between the Sacred Writings and the Literature of Jewish and Heathen Authors. Vol. 1. 2nd ed., London 1819.
- (2834) WILHELM SOLTAU: Petrusanekdoten und Petruslegenden in der Apostelgeschichte. In: CARL BEZOLD, ed., *Orientalische Studien*, Theodor Nöldeke zum siebzigsten Geburtstag (2. März 1906) gewidmet von Freunden und Schülern. Vol. 2. Giessen 1906. Pp. 805–815.
- (2835) ROBERT EISLER: 'John of the High-Priestly Kin' in Acts IV. 6 and in Flavius Josephus' 'Jewish War'. In his: *The Enigma of the Fourth Gospel. Its Author and Its Writer*. London 1938. Pp. 39–45.
- (2836) ROLAND BERGMEIER: Loyalität als Gegenstand paulinischer Paraklese. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 13, 1 ff. and Jos. B.J. 2, 140. In: *Theokratia* 1, 1967, pp. 51–63.
- (2837) SVERRE AALEN: A Rabbinic Formula in 1 Cor. 14. 34. In: *Studia Evangelica* 2. 1, 1964, pp. 513–525.

DELLING (2826) reports on the plan of a *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, a collection of Greek and Latin texts, in particular of the Hellenistic-Roman period, which illuminate the texts of the New Testament from its background.

WIKENHAUSER (2827) cites a number of dreams mentioned in the New Testament, classifies them by motifs, and cites parallels with Josephus and with Greek and Latin pagan literature.

SCHLATTER (2828), who composed his own dictionary of Josephus for such a purpose, is particularly concerned with the language of Matthew as compared with Josephus.

SCHWARK (2829), comparing Matthew and Josephus with regard to their social origins, concludes that Matthew's observations on culture, religion, the value of study, and the cult of the Temple, as well as the theological judgment on the fall of Jerusalem, show Matthew unequivocally, like Josephus, as coming from a learned Pharisaic background.

CADBURY (2830), pp. 164–178, examines Josephus' literary method of paraphrase, particularly as seen in his reworking of I Maccabees, as an indication of Luke's method in paraphrasing Mark. We may comment that the subject of exactly how ancient authors paraphrased their sources has never been really studied and certainly deserves to be, and, indeed, has been done by COHEN

(2831); but there are basic differences, namely that Josephus may not be directly paraphrasing I Maccabees, and that both may have additional sources.

BLINZLER (2832), pp. 30–35, sees parallels between Luke 14. 16–24 and 19. 11–29, on the one hand, and Josephus' characterization of Herod Antipas in *Antiquities* 18. 245–256. The comparison, we may comment, is rather remote, and there can be no question of influence.

Several writers, notably GRAY (2833), pp. 357–368, have contended that St. Paul's voyage is apparently to be compared to a similar incident at almost the same time recounted in Josephus' *Life* 14–15, and have suggested, though there is no evidence in either writer, that Paul and Josephus were traveling companions on this occasion.

As to the relation between Josephus and the Book of Acts, several writers, such as SOLTAU (2834), have suggested, though there is no conclusive evidence, that the Peter legends, especially in the second chapter of Acts, are dependent not on Josephus but on Jewish tradition, and that the composer of Acts generally was under Josephus' influence, at least in some details and in diction.

EISLER (2835) equates John of the high priestly family of Annas of Acts 4. 6 with John the son of Ananus (*War* 2. 568), who was entrusted with the command of the provinces of Gophna and Acrabetta in northeast Judaea. It would seem natural, he says, that the son of Annas (Ananias) the high priest, whose five sons all became high priests, should be chosen to lead one of these armies. And yet, we may comment, though Acts mentions Annas the high priest and Caiaphas and John and Alexander, it does not indicate the relationship of John to Annas. Moreover, though Josephus lists these five sons, John is not among them. EISLER, realizing this, suggests that John is an alternate name for one of them (perhaps for Jonathan?). We may comment, however, that Josephus distinguishes in the 'War' between Ananias and Ananus (the father of the five sons who became high priests), and we may suggest that perhaps the father of this John is identical with the Ananias, the high priest the son of Nedebaeus (*War* 2. 293), who was murdered by brigands (*War* 2. 441).

BERGMEIER (2836) concludes that *War* 2. 140 differs from Romans 13. 1 only in the fact that in the former the discussion is of the relationship to the leaders of the Essene community, whereas in the latter it is of the relationship to the political leaders, and that in both texts there is a theological foundation for the duty of obedience.

AALLEN (2837) finds a Jewish origin, as seen in textual comparisons with Josephus, for the technical terms of the interdiction formula and the allusion to the law in I Corinthians 14. 34.

### 23.14: The Census of Quirinius in Josephus and in Luke

(2838) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Selected Literature on Quirinius' Assessment* (*Ant.* xviii. 1). Appendix B. In: *Josephus*, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965. Pp. 556–557.

(2839) DAMIANUS LAZZARATO: *Chronologia Christi; seu discordantium fontium concordantia ad juris normam*. Naples 1952.

- (2840) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C. – A.D. 135). Rev. and ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973. Excursus I: The Census of Quirinius, Luke 2: 1–5. Pp. 399–427.
- (2841) KARL H. RENGSTORF: *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Bd. 3). Göttingen 1937.
- (2842) LOUIS C. FILLION: *Vie des N.-S. Jesus-Christ, exposé historique, critique et apolo-gétique*. 3 vols. Paris 1922. Trans. into English by NEWTON THOMPSON: *The Life of Christ, a historical, critical, and apologetic exposition*. 3 vols. St. Louis 1928–29.
- (2843) ROBERT K. SHERK: *The Legates of Galatia*. In: *Johns Hopkins Studies in History and Political Science*, Ser. 69, 1951, pp. 21–24.
- (2844) LILY R. TAYLOR: *Quirinius and the Census of Judaea*. In: *American Journal of Philology* 54, 1933, pp. 120–133.
- (2845) WILLIAM M. RAMSAY: *Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? A Study on the Credibility of St. Luke*. London 1898.
- (2846) ADRIAN N. SHERWIN-WHITE: *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament*. Oxford 1963.
- (2847) DONALD MCKINNON: *The Census of Quirinius*. Diss. Licentiate, Catholic University, Faculty of Theology, Washington 1898. Summary in: *Catholic University Bulletin* 5, 1899, pp. 315–336.
- (2848) FRITZ M. HEICHELHEIM: *Roman Syria*. In: TENNEY FRANK, ed., *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*. Vol. 4, Baltimore 1938, pp. 121–257.
- (2849) PHILIPP E. HUSCHKE: *Über den zur Zeit der Geburt Jesu Christi gehaltenen Census*. Breslau 1840.
- (2850) MARIE-JOSEPH LAGRANGE: *Où en est la question du recensement de Quirinius?* In: *Revue Biblique* 8, 1911, pp. 60–84.
- (2851) NIGEL TURNER: *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*. Edinburgh 1966.
- (2852) ANTOON G. ROOS: *Die Quirinius-Inschrift*. In: *Mnemosyne*, 3rd ser., vol. 9, 1940–41, pp. 306–318.
- (2853) RONALD SYME: *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford 1939.
- (2854) JAKOB A.O. LARSEN: *Tituli Asia Minoris*, II, 508: Part I: Introduction, Text, and Commentary. In: *Classical Philology* 38, 1943, pp. 177–190.
- (2855) MORITZ VON ABERLE: *Über den Statthalter Quirinius*. In: *Theologische Quartalschrift* 47, 1865, pp. 103–148.
- (2856) SILVIO ACCAME: *Il primo censimento della Giudea*. In: *Rivista di Filologia e d'Istruzione classica* 22–23, 1944–45, pp. 138–170.
- (2857) WILFRED L. KNOX: *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity*. London 1944.
- (2858) BURNETT H. STREETER: *The Four Gospels; a study of Origins, treating of the manu-script tradition, sources, authorship, and dates*. London 1924.
- (2859) LOUIS GIRARD: *Le cadre chronologique du ministère de Jésus*. Paris 1953.
- (2860) F. X. STEINMETZER: *Census*. In: THEODOR KLAUSER, ed., *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 2, Stuttgart 1954, pp. 969–972.
- (2861) HORST BRAUNERT: *Der römische Provinzialzensus und der Schätzungsbericht des Lukas-Evangeliums*. In: *Historia* 6, 1957, pp. 192–214.
- (2862) HANS U. INSTINSKY: *Das Jahr der Geburt Christi: eine geschichtswissenschaftliche Studie*. München 1957.
- (2863) ETHELBERG STAUFFER: *Jesus, Gestalt und Geschichte* (Dalp-Taschenbücher, Bd. 332). Bern 1957. Trans. into English by RICHARD and CLARA WINSTON: *Jesus and His Story*. New York 1960.
- (2864) ALFRED R. C. LEANEY: *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*. London 1958.
- (2865) WALTER GRUNDMANN: *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament, Bd. 3). 2nd ed., Berlin 1961.

- (2865a) GAETANO BAGLIO: *Gesù e re Erode nella storia da Daniele a S. Paolo*. Naples 1938.
- (2865b) MAX MEINERTZ: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 5th ed., Paderborn 1950. Pp. 198–199.
- (2866) JACK FINEGAN: *Handbook of Biblical Chronology: Principles of Time Reckoning in the Ancient World and Problems of Chronology in the Bible*. Princeton 1964.
- (2867) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: I. The Date of the Birth and the Crucifixion of Jesus; II. The Crucifixion, a Libelous Accusation against the Jews. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 55, 1964–65, pp. 1–22.
- (2868) MERRILL C. TENNEY: *New Testament Times*. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1965.
- (2869) GEORGE OGG: The Quirinius Question To-day. In: *Expository Times* 79, 1967–68, pp. 231–236.
- (2870) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: King Herod, the Man and His Work (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1960. Trans. into German by JEHOSEHUA AMIR: *König Herodes. Der Mann und sein Werk* (*Studia Judaica*, 4). Berlin 1968.
- (2871) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: Behind the New Testament. In: *Greece and Rome* 17, 1970, pp. 81–99.
- (2872) HORST R. MOEHRING: The Census in Luke as an Apologetic Device. In: DAVID C. AUNE, ed., *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (*Supplements to Novum Testamentum*, 33; *Festschrift A. P. W. Wikgren*). Leiden 1972. Pp. 144–160.
- (2873) MENAHEM STERN: The Census of Quirinus. Appendix I. In: SHMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, in co-operation with DAVID FLUSSER and WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK, *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (*Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*, Section 1). Assen 1974. Pp. 372–374.
- (2873a) JACK FINEGAN: *Light from the Ancient Past: The Archaeological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion*. Princeton 1946. 2nd ed., 1959.
- (2873b) HANS U. INSTINSKY: Begab es sich in jenen Tagen? Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung. In: *Hochland* 49, 1956–57, pp. 97–108.
- (2873c) H. E. W. TURNER: The Chronological Framework of the Ministry. In: DENNIS E. NINEHAM et al., edd., *Historicity and Chronology in the New Testament* (*Theological Collections*, 6). London 1965. Pp. 59–74.
- (2873d) LOUIS DEPRAZ: *De l'Association de Tibère aux principat à la naissance du Christ* (*Studia Friburgensia: Nouvelle Série*, 43). Fribourg 1966.
- (2873e) P. W. BARNETT: Ἀπογραφὴ and ἀπογράφεσθαι in Luke 2. 1–5. In: *Expository Times* 85, 1974, pp. 377–380.
- (2873f) E. MARY SMALLWOOD: The Census at the Time of Christ's Nativity. Appendix E in her: *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden 1976. Pp. 568–571.
- (2873g) JOHN D. M. DERRETT: Further Light on the Narratives of the Nativity. In: *Novum Testamentum* 17, 1975, pp. 81–108. Rpt. in his: *Law in the New Testament* 2, Leiden 1978, pp. 4–32.

I (2838) have a select bibliography on the census of Quirinius (*Ant.* 18. 1–2). Fuller bibliographies are given by LAZZARATO (2839), pp. 44–45, and SCHÜRER (2840), pp. 399–400.

Luke 2. 1–5 speaks of “the first enrollment, when Quirinus was governor of Syria” at the time of the birth of Jesus, which he appears to date near the end of the reign of Herod (4 B.C.E.). Josephus (*Ant.* 17. 355–18. 2) speaks of an enrollment by Quirinius, governor of Syria, when Archelaus was removed from his kingship of Judea in 6 or 7 C.E.

RENGSTORF (2841), pp. 28–29, seeks to salvage Luke by suggesting that Josephus had in mind a second census made after the death of Herod. This would seem to be supported by Luke's statement that this was the first enrollment when Quirinius was governor of Syria, implying that there were later enrollments. From this it would appear, as FILLION (2842), vol. 1, pp. 507–515, had noted, that Luke had the advantage over Josephus in that he knew of two censuses. And yet, we may note that in Acts 5. 37 Luke, the author of Acts, specifically has Gamaliel mention "the census" (τῆς ἀπογραφῆς) during which Judas the Galilaean arose, the implication being that this was the famous census. We may, however, object that at the time of his successful expedition against the wild Homanadenses in Asia Minor, Quirinius was governor of Galatia and not of Syria, as SHERK (2843) and TAYLOR (2844) have convincingly shown against RAMSAY (2845). Moreover, we know the names of the governors of Syria from 10/9 to 7/6 B.C.E. (Sentius Saturninus) and from 7/6 – 4 B.C.E. (Quintilius Varus). This leaves no room for a governorship of Syria for Quirinius during the last years of Herod's reign. We may add that it is Josephus' general habit when mentioning someone for the first time to give background information on him, and we should therefore have expected that when introducing Quirinius in War 2. 433 and Antiquities 17. 355, he would indicate that this Quirinius had also been governor of Syria earlier. To reply, with SHERWIN-WHITE (2846), that such silence is not decisive, since Josephus' primary interest was in Judea rather than in Syria, is to disregard the fact that Judea was a major concern of any governor of Syria. We may add that Josephus mentions the census of Quirinius as shocking (Ant. 18. 3) the Jews, presumably because it was unprecedented, and thus giving rise to the Fourth Philosophy movement.

Moreover, if we say that the census described by Josephus was the second, we are left with the question as to why Josephus omitted such a notable event as the first census. In this connection, MCKINNON (2847) had already suggested that Josephus deliberately omitted the first census because he drew on Nicolaus of Damascus, a flatterer of Herod, who regarded the census as hardly to Herod's credit; but we may reply that Josephus' account of Herod in the 'Antiquities' is considerably more critical than is the one in the 'War' and certainly is far from a whitewash.

HEICHELHEIM (2848), pp. 160–161, following HUSCHKE (2849), 78ff., LAGRANGE (2850), and others, and in turn followed by TURNER (2851), pp. 23–24, attempts to vindicate Luke by translating: "This census [of 4 B.C.E.] was the first before that under the prefectureship of Quirinius in Syria (πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου). Such a usage of πρώτος in the sense of comparing two disparate ideas is unparalleled, as SCHÜRER (2840), pp. 421–422, notes; and, in any case, we may add, there is no parallel in Luke. Moreover, there is no parallel for the use of πρώτος in the sense of "before" followed by a genitive absolute or a genitive of a participial clause. SCHÜRER correctly adds that it does not make much sense to say that the census took place earlier than when Quirinius was governing Syria rather than stating who was governor at the time of the census. Finally, even if we adopt HUSCHKE's and HEICHELHEIM's forced meaning for πρώτη, the meaning would be "this census

took place earlier than when Quirinius was governor of Syria"; it does not indicate that there was an earlier census under Herod and a later one under Quirinius.

Roos (2852) argues that an inscription found in Tivoli (*Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae* 918) which records the career of a [*legatus pro praetore*] *divi Augusti iterum Syriam et Phoenicem optinuit* refers to Quirinius and that this confirms the fact that he held the governorship of Syria twice. The inscription, we may note, does not have a name; but we may add that the meaning may well be that he held a governorship for a second time in Syria without indicating when he had held the governorship previously. Indeed, SYME (2853), p. 398, argues that the inscription belongs to Lucius Calpurnius Piso, who was governor of Asia in 3–2 B.C.E. and later of Syria in 4–1 B.C.E.

One problem, we may note, is that the word which Josephus uses (Ant. 18. 1) for Quirinius being governor of Syria is δικαιοδότης, which is found only here and in inscriptions from Lycia in this sense, as LARSEN (2854), pp. 188–189, has noted. ABERLE (2855) had already asserted that Quirinius was not governor of Syria but *legatus iuridicus* and *legatus censuum accipiendorum* and hence only *legatus Caesaris*; he concludes that Josephus should not thus be used to prove that Quirinius was governor in 6 C.E. We may reply that the problem is not so much whether Quirinius was governor in 6 C.E. but whether he took a census in 6 C.E. or in 4 B.C.E. We may remark that Josephus' terminology is not precise and that he uses several words or circumlocutions for governor – ἡγεμῶν, ἐπιστατών, ἐπίτροπος, πρεσβευτής, προεσθηκώς. The word δικαιοδότης, as LARSEN plausibly suggests, was not so much a title for a governor as an honorary appellation, much like σωτήρ or εὐεργέτης. It would emphasize the high regard with which the governor was held as an honest judge, the duties of the governor (in Lycia, at least) being largely judicial.

ACCAME (2856) unsuccessfully contests the thesis of TAYLOR (2844) that Luke was mistaken in naming Quirinius as governor of Syria.

KNOX (2857), p. 10, suggests that Luke, knowing the tradition recorded by Josephus that the census of Quirinius was connected with the rise of the Fourth Philosophy, assigned the birth of Jesus to the same period on the ground of appropriateness, although Luke himself did not realize it. We may comment that inasmuch as Jesus was accused, as the inscription on the cross indicates, of seeking to lead a revolution so as to become king of the Jews, such a tradition may come from those who connected Jesus with political claims.

STREETER (2858) suggests that Luke may have derived his information through hearing Josephus lecture in Rome; but, we may reply, this seems unlikely because of the discrepancies between them.

LAZZARATO (2839), pp. 51 ff., says that ἡγεμονεύοντος in Luke 2. 2 does not necessarily mean governor of a province, but may refer to any ruler or commissioner. Quirinius, he says, was put in charge not of Syria but of the East; the major objection to this, we may reply, is that Luke says specifically that he was in charge of Syria. We may add that while LAZZARATO's work shows massive research, it suffers from having set out to defend and justify the tradition of the

Roman Catholic Church concerning the dates of Jesus' birth (25 December 6 B.C.E.) and death (25 March 29 C.E.).

GIRARD (2859), pp. 45–49, assuming that Luke's statement about the census can be trusted as the basis for the date of Jesus' birth, concludes that Jesus was born in 8 B.C.E.

STEINMETZER (2860) finds the silence of Josephus no obstacle to his conclusion that the census of Luke 2. 1 must have begun in 9/8 B.C.E. and that it must have ended in the following year.

BRAUNERT (2861) concludes that Luke erred because he sought to connect the birth of Jesus with the census, although he realized that this was against the facts, since, as a patriotic Jew, he tried to combine Jewish nationalism with the Christian faith. We may, indeed, comment that Luke may have confused the breakdown of law and order after Herod's death with what occurred after Archelaus' exile; but the sharpest dividing line between early Christianity and Judaism was that the former was apolitical and did not participate in the revolt against Rome. It would seem strange for Luke, who argues that Jesus was not a political Messiah, or his sources to seek deliberately to connect Jesus with the origin of the Fourth Philosophy; this appears to be the work of Christianity's opponents, who sought to show that Jesus put forth claims as a political Messiah in accordance with the mainstream of the Jewish tradition with regard to the function of a Messiah.

INSTINSKY (2862), pp. 21–22, 39–42, says that there may have been two censuses.

STAUFFER (2863) defends Luke's version of the census by postulating that Quirinius was governor from 12 B.C.E. to 16 C.E. with only a brief interruption, and that the censuses took several years, the first step being the registration of taxable objects and persons. We may respond by noting that Josephus (Ant. 18. 2–3) makes no such distinction but speaks in immediate juxtaposition of the registration (ἀπογραφαῖς, Ant. 18. 3) and the assessment (ἀπετίμων). STAUFFER argues that the fact that Herod was allowed to mint only copper money shows that he was as restricted and dependent with regard to the census as other petty rulers. We may reply that when it came to taxes the evidence is conclusive that Herod was independent of Roman suzerainty. As to the method in which the census was taken, STAUFFER plausibly suggests that in Antiquities 5. 76–79 (with extra-Biblical details not found in Joshua 17. 8–9), describing the way in which Joshua made his assessment, Josephus is drawing upon the Roman methods of his time.

LEANEY (2864) concludes that either Luke or his source introduced the census into the story to ensure the birth of Jesus taking place at Bethlehem. He suggests that this may have been the result of a deliberate attempt on the part of Luke's source to associate Jesus' birth with the rise of the Zealots (i.e. the Fourth Philosophy).

GRUNDMANN (2865) attempts to place the census in Herod's lifetime.

Tertullian (Adversus Marcionem 4. 19) reads Σατουρνίνου (Saturninus) for Κυρηνίου (Quirinius) in Luke 2. 2 and thus resolves the problem. But, as SCHÜRER (2840), p. 257, and SHERWIN-WHITE (2846), pp. 162–171, have



shown, Saturninus must have governed Syria in the years before 6 B.C.E. and hence cannot be the governor referred to by Luke. SHERWIN-WHITE suggests, though without evidence, that Luke's contradiction in transferring the census of 6 C.E. under Quirinius to the end of Herod's reign in 4 B.C.E. may be due to the fact that he accepted the incompatible synchronism of two nativities, those of John and of Jesus. But if we accept SHERWIN-WHITE's date of 6 for the birth of Jesus, this would make Jesus only about twenty-two at the beginning of his ministry, whereas Luke (3. 23) says that he was about thirty in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius (28 C.E.).

BAGLIO (2865a) insists that the historical background of the birth of Jesus in the Gospels of Luke and Matthew and the account of Josephus in Book 17 of the 'Antiquities' are in full accord.

I have not seen MEINERTZ (2865b), who deals with the possible influence of Josephus on Luke.

FINEGAN (2866), pp. 234–238, after summarizing the evidence and the views of scholars, verifies Josephus' chronology.

ZEITLIN (2867) assumes that the census took place in 6 C.E.

TENNEY (2868), pp. 134–137, argues for the historicity of the census described by Luke as well as of that mentioned by Josephus.

OGG (2869) explains the discrepancy between Luke and Josephus by asserting that Luke had heard that a census was the occasion of the journey of Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem but that he failed to realize that this was a Jewish, possibly a sacerdotal, census. We may comment that there is no evidence of such a Jewish census, let alone a sacerdotal census, during the Hellenistic-Roman period; and in view of the strong prejudice against censuses generally recorded in the Bible (II Samuel 24. 10), it seems unlikely. OGG says that attempts to blame Josephus for incorrectly dating the census in 6–7 C.E. are now considered unsuccessful. The attempt of RAMSAY (2845) to prove that Quirinius was twice governor is no longer widely accepted. OGG objects to the interpretation of HEICHELHEIM (2848) that Luke's census took place before Quirinius was governor, since nowhere is *πρῶτος* followed by a genitive absolute, nor does the genitive of a participial clause have the meaning "before". He concludes that Quirinius must have been governor not of Syria but of Galatia when he conducted the Homonadensian war, and that Luke 2. 1–2 refers to the same census as that of Josephus in 6 or 7 C.E. He says that this must have the first census of its kind in Judaea, for had there been an earlier census under Roman administration it would undoubtedly have provoked a serious disturbance and would almost certainly not have been left unnoticed by Josephus. Josephus (War 2. 118, Ant. 18. 4ff.), he says, attaches the revolt of Judas and the rise of the Zealot (he means the Fourth Philosophy) movement to the census of Quirinius; and KNOX (2857) and OGG are inclined to suspect that Luke had a tradition which assigned the birth of Jesus to the same period on the ground of appropriateness, though Luke himself did not realize it. He suggests that certain Judeo-Christians shifted Jesus' birth to 6 or 7 C.E. to effect a connection between Jesus and the origin of the Zealots and that Luke picked this up. We may comment that if Luke had been written before the outbreak of the

revolution against Rome this theory would seem more likely, since it would identify the new Christian group with the popular revolutionaries; but after the revolution such an identification would be downright dangerous, and, in any case, certainly by this time Christianity had emerged with a concept of a spiritual Messiah and in opposition to political revolution.

SCHALIT (2870) postulates that during the reign of Herod several censuses took place.

SMALLWOOD (2871), in the course of a popular survey of Jewish history of Palestine of the period from 63 B.C.E., discusses the Quirinius controversy at relative length and notes approvingly SHERWIN-WHITE's (2846) appraisal of the present state of the question as an "agnostic stalemate". She plausibly suggests, however, that Luke simply committed a "howler" and attached the name of Quirinius, famous for the census of 6 C.E., to an earlier census of 6 B.C.E.

MOEHRING (2872) argues that Luke cannot be relied upon, since he had a definite apologetic goal in mind when he connected the birth of Jesus with the Roman census, namely that he wished to show that Joseph, in contrast to the nationalist fanatics, obeyed the order. Luke thus wished to show that at no time, indeed from its very beginning, did Christianity constitute a threat to the security of the Roman Empire. We may comment that if, indeed, Luke wished to contrast Joseph with the nationalist fanatics he omits even the slightest hint of this; on the contrary, he says (Luke 2. 3) that "all went to be enrolled, each to his own city", giving no indication, such as Josephus highlights, that the census was the occasion for the rise of the rebel movement.

STERN (2873) concludes that Quirinius was governing Galatia and Pamphylia rather than Syria at the time of his expedition against the Homonadenses, and that Josephus is right against Luke.

FINEGAN (2873a), pp. 258–261, stresses that the census mentioned by Josephus in 6 or 7 C.E. was the second by Quirinius, the first having taken place in 7 or 6 B.C.E.

INSTINSKY (2873b), in a popular article, concludes that there were two censuses.

TURNER (2873c), pp. 60–65, suggests that there had been an earlier census. As to why Josephus had been silent about it, he answers that Josephus' pro-Roman sympathies may well have been decisive. It is noteworthy, he adds, that the later census of 6 C.E. receives only passing mention in the 'Antiquities' and is omitted altogether in the 'War'.

DUPRAZ (2873d), pp. 143–220, concludes that Luke and Josephus do not contradict each other with regard to the census; there is only the silence of Josephus with regard to the government of Quirinius in Syria before Varus and on the entire public life of Jesus.

BARNETT (2873e) suggests that Luke 2. 2 be translated "this was an enrollment conducted before Quirinius was governor of Syria". Luke, he believes, was thinking of Herod's requirement in 7 B.C.E. that all his subjects take an oath to Augustus and to himself – an incident which Josephus mentions in *Antiquities* 17. 42.

SMALLWOOD (2873f) thinks that the simplest explanation of the discrepancy between Luke and Josephus is that Luke has erred. Knowing that the nativity coincided with a census taken in Judea on instructions from Rome, Luke, she suggests, erroneously attached the name of the Roman official responsible for the later, much more notorious, census to the earlier one, with which Quirinius had had no connection, and having thus connected two censuses conducted under the same man's auspices, he distinguished the earlier as *πρώτη*. Tertulian then confused the date, while tacitly correcting the name.

DERRETT (2873g), pp. 82–94, comments on the census in Luke and in Josephus.

### 23.15: Theudas in Josephus and in Acts

- (2874) HENRY J. CADBURY: Luke's Indebtedness to Josephus. In: FREDERICK J. FOAKES-JACKSON and KIRSOPP LAKE, *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Vol. 2. London 1922. Pp. 355–358.
- (2875) JOSEPH W. SWAIN: Gamaliel's Speech and Caligula's Statue. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 37, 1944, pp. 341–349.
- (2876) WILFRED L. KNOX: *The Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge 1948.
- (2877) MARTIN DIBELIUS: Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte und die antike Geschichtsschreibung (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Jhrg. 1949, 1. Abh.). Heidelberg 1949. In his: *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*, ed. by HEINRICH GREEVEN. Göttingen 1951. Pp. 120–162. Trans. into English by MARY LING in his: *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. by HEINRICH GREEVEN. New York 1956. Pp. 138–191.
- (2878) FREDERICK F. BRUCE, ed.: *The Acts of the Apostles*. London 1951; 2nd ed., 1952.
- (2879) LUCIEN CAMPEAU: Theudas le faux prophète et Judas le Galiléen. In: *Sciences ecclésiastiques* (Montréal) 5, 1953–54, pp. 235–245.
- (2879a) ALAN H. MCNEILE: *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*. 2nd. ed., Oxford 1953.
- (2880) CHARLES S. C. WILLIAMS: *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. London 1957.
- (2881) PAUL WINTER: *Miszellen zur Apostelgeschichte*. 1. Acta 5. 36: Theudas. In: *Evangelische Theologie* 17, 1957, pp. 398–399.
- (2882) AUGUST KÖHLER: Theudas. In: PHILIP SCHAFF, ed., *A Religious Encyclopædia or Dictionary of Biblical, Historical, Doctrinal, and Practical Theology*. Vol. 3. New York 1883. P. 2349.
- (2883) ARNOLD EHRHARDT: The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles. In: *Studia Theologica* 12, 1958, pp. 45–79.
- (2884) MATTHEW BLACK: Judas of Galilee and Josephus's 'Fourth Philosophy'. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 45–54.
- (2885) ALBERT C. CLARK: *The Acts of the Apostles*. Oxford 1933.
- (2885a) FERDINAND HAHN: *Christologische Hoheitstitel. Ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (based on diss., Heidelberg: Anfänge christologischer Traditionen). Göttingen 1963. Trans. into English by HAROLD KNIGHT and GEORGE OGG: *The Titles of Jesus in Christology; their history in early Christianity*. London 1969.
- (2885b) ODIL H. STECK: *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten. Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Neukirchen–Vluyn 1967.

(2885c) JOSEPH A. FITZMYER and DANIEL J. HARRINGTON: *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts* (Second Century B.C.—Second Century A.D.) (*Biblica et Orientalia*, 34). Rome 1978.

Josephus (Ant. 20. 97–98) mentions a false prophet named Theudas, who persuaded the masses to take up their possessions and to follow him to the Jordan River, which, he said, would part at his command. He was intercepted by the procurator Fadus, whose men slew him and many of his followers. Luke, the author of Acts, gives an account (Acts 5. 36) of a certain Theudas who “gave himself out to be a somebody” and led four hundred men until he was slain and his followers dispersed. The identity of the name Theudas, which is uncommon, is striking, and yet there is a chronological discrepancy between the two accounts, since the reference to Theudas in Acts is found in a speech which Gamaliel must have made before 36/37, whereas the revolt mentioned by Josephus occurred after 44. Moreover, whereas Josephus in *Antiquities* 20. 102, almost immediately after he recounts the incident of Theudas, mentions the crucifixion of the sons of Judas the Galilaean, Gamaliel says that after Theudas Judas the Galilaean arose in the days of the census (6 C.E.). CADBURY (2874) had argued that in the instance of Theudas the case for Luke’s dependence on Josephus is strongest, but the fact that Luke gives an exact number for the followers of Theudas, whereas Josephus merely says “the masses” indicates that Luke had another or an additional source, and the discrepancies noted above argue against dependence.

SWAIN (2875) explains the chronological discrepancy between the Theudas of Acts and the Theudas of Josephus by suggesting that Gamaliel’s speech was misplaced by the author of Acts and should be inserted in chapter 12 in connection with the arrest of Peter. We may comment that there is no evidence for such a displacement, and that in any case the basic problem remains, namely the fact that Acts places Judas and the census after Theudas.

KNOX (2876), though he regards Josephus as the most unreliable and mendacious of writers, suggests, pp. 22–23, that in this case Luke took his information not from Josephus but from the same source as Josephus, though he reproduced it less correctly.

DIBELIUS (2877) says that we cannot conclude from Acts 5. 36–37 that Acts was dependent on the ‘*Antiquities*’. Luke, he concludes, reworded these incidents as freely as he composed the earlier speech; he was simply mistaken about Theudas.

BRUCE (2878), p. 18, concludes that where there are discrepancies between Luke and Josephus, Luke is at least as likely to be right as Josephus. He adds (p. 25) that there is no ground for believing that either Luke or Josephus was acquainted with the other’s work.

CAMPEAU (2879) accounts for the difference between Josephus and Acts by noting that Gamaliel, in whose mouth the account of Theudas is found, was an orator who had schematized the matter, whereas Josephus was an historian who was interested in details. As to the discrepancy between Judas and the sons of Judas, he suggests that Gamaliel, in a very Jewish fashion of speaking, attributes to the father the tragic end of the sons. We may comment that orators may be

expected to take liberties with the coloring of details, but there is no apparent motive for a different dating. As to attributing to the father the tragic end of the sons, we may note that Gamaliel specifically associates Judas with “the days of the census”, and this can only be Judas and not his sons.

MCNEILE (2879a), pp. 35–37, concludes that it is unlikely that Luke is dependent on Josephus for his account of Theudas and Lysanias.

WILLIAMS (2880), pp. 19–22, concludes that the theory of Luke’s dependence on Josephus is flimsy but that they had common source. But, we may add, even the hypothesis of a common source cannot explain such glaring discrepancies within such a brief compass.

WINTER (2881) suggests that Theudas is a nickname chosen by himself or by his followers for *te’udoth*, signifying “testimonies”. He then adds that since it is unlikely that two different people would bear the same nickname, the historicity of the speech of Gamaliel is even less likely. We may comment that aside from the discrepancy in transliteration it is not at all unlikely that two people would bear the same nickname, especially if the nickname is at all common. KÖHLER (2882) has more plausibly suggested that the name Theudas may be equivalent to Θεοδῶρος, which would be the Greek translation of the Hebrew name Mattathias, i.e. Ματθαίας, the expert in Jewish law who urged the Jews to pull down the golden eagle from the Temple (War 1. 648–650, Ant. 17. 149, 151) and who was captured and burned alive by Herod (Ant. 17. 157, 167). This would place him before Judas in the correct chronological order.

EHRHARDT (2883), pp. 64–65, concludes that Josephus and Luke used a common source.

BLACK (2884) follows CLARK (2885), pp. liv and 33, in postulating that the Theudas and Judas *stichoi* have been transposed.

HAHN (2885a), pp. 361–362, comments on Theudas (Ant. 20. 97–98) and other prophetic types, especially messianic pretenders in Josephus.

STECK (2885b), p. 240, comments on the eschatological prophet Theudas (Ant. 20. 97), the Egyptian (Ant. 20. 169), the Samaritan (Ant. 18. 85ff.), and the Sicarius Jonathan (War 7. 437ff.).

FITZMYER and HARRINGTON (2885c), p. 246, comment on the Er-Ram ossuary in connection with Theudas (Ant. 20. 97–99 and Acts 5. 36).

### 23.16: Other Parallels between Josephus and Luke-Acts

(2886) HENRY J. CADBURY: Luke’s Indebtedness to Josephus. In: FREDERICK J. FOAKES-JACKSON and KIRSOPP LAKE, *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Vol. 2. London 1922. Pp. 355–358.

(2887) CHARLES S. C. WILLIAMS: *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. London 1957.

(2888) ALFRED WIKENHAUSER: Doppelträume. In: *Biblica* 29, 1948, pp. 100–111.

(2889) ETHELBERG STAUFFER: Jüdisches Erbe im urchristlichen Kirchenrecht. In: *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 77, 1952, pp. 201–206.

(2890) DIETER LÜHRMANN: Noah und Lot (Lk 17, 26–29) – ein Nachtrag. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 63, 1972, pp. 130–132.

- (2891) JOSEPH BLENKINSOPP: Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, 1974, pp. 239–262.
- (2891a) ADOLF SCHLATTER: Das Evangelium des Lukas. Aus seinen Quellen erklärt. Stuttgart 1931; 2nd ed., 1960.
- (2891b) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: Untersuchungen zum Quellenproblem der Apostelgeschichte. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 36, 1937, pp. 205–221.
- (2891c) PAUL WINTER: The Cultural Background of the Narrative in Luke I and II. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 45, 1954–55, pp. 159–167.
- (2891d) EUGENIUSZ DĄBROWSKI: Dzieje Apostolskie. Poznań 1961.
- (2891e) JOCHEN BLEICKEN: Senatsergericht und Kaisergericht; eine Studie zur Entwicklung des Prozessrechtes im frühen Prinzipat (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 3. Folge, Nr. 53). Göttingen 1962.
- (2891f) KARL H. RENGSTORF: Die Re-Investitur des Verlorenen Sohnes in der Gleichniserzählung Jesu Luk. 15, 11–32. Köln and Opladen 1967.
- (2891g) GEORG OGG: The Chronology of the Life of Paul. London 1968.
- (2891h) HAROLD W. HOEHNER: Why Did Pilate Hand Jesus over to Antipas? In: ERNEST BAMMEL, ed., *Cambridge Studies in Honour of C. F. D. Moule*. London 1970. Pp. 84–90.
- (2891i) HENRY J. CADBURY: Litotes in Acts. In: *Festschrift F. Wilbur Gingrich*. Leiden 1972. Pp. 58–59.
- (2891j) MAX KRENKEL: Josephus und Lukas. Der schriftstellerische Einfluß des jüdischen Geschichtsschreibers auf den christlichen nachgewiesen. Leipzig 1894.
- (2891k) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: Paul et l'antiféminisme. In: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 60, 1976, pp. 261–280.
- (2891l) BENJAMIN J. HUBBARD: Luke, Josephus and Rome: A Comparative Approach to the Lukan *Sitz in Leben*. In: *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, vol. 1, ed. PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 59–68.
- (2891m) HUGH J. SCHONFIELD: The Jesus Party. New York 1974.
- (2891n) W. WARD GASQUE: A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles. Diss., Univ. of Manchester 1969. Publ.: Grand Rapids, Michigan 1975.
- (2891o) MICHAEL J. COOK: Mark's Treatment of the Jewish Leaders (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 51). Leiden 1978.

Luke 3. 1 mentions Lysanias as tetrarch of Abilene in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius (28), whereas the only Lysanias who ruled over a district in this geographical area died in 36 B.C.E., according to Josephus (Ant. 15. 92).

CADBURY (2886) concludes that an inaccurate knowledge of Josephus will adequately account for what he calls Luke's error, but we may note that Josephus says that the Lysanias who died in 36 B.C.E. was the ruler of Chalcis in Lebanon, and that while it is true that Abila is also a district in Lebanon, it may not be the same district. Moreover, Josephus mentions the tetrarchy of Lysanias in connection with its being added to Agrippa I's kingdom by the Roman Emperor Gaius Caligula (Ant. 18. 237) in 37 C.E., whereas four years later (Ant. 19. 275) he says that Claudius added Abila, which had been ruled by Lysanias, to Agrippa's realm, apparently implying that Abila was distinct from the first grant.

Josephus (War. 2. 261–263, Ant. 20. 169–172) mentions a false prophet from Egypt four hundred of whose followers were slain by the soldiers of the procurator Felix. In War 2. 261 Josephus gives the number of his followers as 30,000. In Acts 21. 38 Paul is asked: "Are you not the Egyptian, then, who

recently stirred up a revolt and led the four thousand men of the Assassins out into the wilderness?" CADBURY (2886) assumes that this is the same as Josephus' false prophet from Egypt and says that since the number of rebels grows in tradition more often than it decreases, Luke's figure is surely more probable. He says that Luke has combined Josephus' account of the rise of the Sicarii (War 2. 254–257) with the account of the false prophets who led people into the desert (War 2. 259) which follows immediately, although Josephus (War 2. 262) says that the Egyptian impostor led his followers from the desert to the Mount of Olives. We may comment that the fact that there are three discrepancies in a single sentence – namely, the number of followers, the fact that the Egyptian was not a leader of Sicarii, and the fact that he led his men out of the wilderness rather than into it – must leave us unconvinced. In view of these differences, WILLIAMS (2887) surely goes too far in suggesting that Luke perhaps knew the 'War' in the original Aramaic version or that he had a similar source.

WIKENHAUSER (2888) cites a number of parallels from various ancient authors, including Josephus, to the dreams and double visions of Acts 9. 10–16 and 10. 1–11. 8.

STAUFFER (2889) cites parallels from Josephus (War 2. 122, 123, 134, 143, 146, 150) to Acts 1. 13–26 and to Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* 25. 2–6.

LÜHRMANN (2890) notes that the tradition in Luke 17. 26–29 which associated the Flood and the destruction of Sodom as examples of G-d's punishment is also reflected in Josephus (War 5. 566) and in *Ecclesiasticus* (16. 6–9), as well as in *Sibylline Oracles* 3. 689–690, with its juxtaposition of judgment by fire and water (a motif, as we have noted above, which is common in rabbinic literature also). Josephus, he notes, extends this to the punishment of the band of Korah.

BLENKINSOPP (2891) notes a parallel between Josephus' dream at Asochis (Life 208–209) and Paul's at Corinth (Acts 18. 9–10).

SCHLATTER (2891a), pp. 565–658, comments on the linguistic kinship of Acts with Josephus. On pp. 659–708 he discusses what is in common between Luke and Josephus; and on pp. 708–710 he comments on the words of Luke that are lacking in Josephus.

JEREMIAS (2891b), pp. 216–217, notes that the famine, through which the journey of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem was arranged (Acts 11. 28–30), is mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 20. 100–101). The famine occurred in 46–48 in the procuratorship of Fadus; and hence Acts 12. 1–23 is an interpolation, since Agrippa I died in 44.

WINTER (2891c) notes the parallels between Josephus and Luke 1. 5 as to the priesthood and the priestly classes. He seeks to show that ἐφημερίδας in Luke 1. 5 and ἐφημερίδος in Josephus (Ant. 12. 265) and the description of the priestly rotation (Apion 2. 108) are almost exactly parallel. He suggests that for the description of Apion 2. 108 Josephus used some source in which it was stated that the twenty-four courses of the priests were, in fact, mere sub-divisions of the "four families". We may, however, remark that Josephus would hardly have needed a special source for this information, since both Ezra (2. 36–39) and Nehemiah (7. 39–42) enumerate four priestly families; and, in any case, as a

priest of the highest group himself, Josephus had first-hand information with regard to the priestly groups.

I have been unable to read DĄBROWSKI (2891d), pp. 90–94.

BLEICKEN (2891e) cites *Antiquities* 20. 137 and 182 and *War* 2. 247, 252, and 271 in determining the date of Paul's trial.

RENGSTORF (2891f), pp. 38, 43, and 54ff., sheds light on the parable of the prodigal son by examining it in relation to ancient rites of investiture, noting the value for this purpose of *War* 1. 457ff., 465, and 667ff.; and *Antiquities* 12. 360 and 17. 194–195.

OGG (2891g), pp. 155–157, cites *Antiquities* 20. 182 to reinforce the interpretation of Acts 24. 27 concerning the procuratorships of Felix and Porcius Festus.

HOEHNER (2891h) cites *War* 1. 474 and 2. 169–177 and *Antiquities* 18. 122 and 163 in elucidating Luke 23. 1–25.

CADBURY (2891i) says that KRENKEL (2891j) is wrong in declaring that we can find in Josephus all cases of litotes that occur in Luke. He adds that Luke conforms to the contemporary idiom, as the papyri show.

DUBARLE (2891k) notes that Paul is often accused of misogyny, but asserts that the texts which have given rise to the strongest accusations (1 Corinthians 14. 34–35 and I Timothy 2. 11–14) are most likely interpolations. When compared with the inattention paid to women by other ancient authors, including Cicero, Seneca, Pliny the Younger, and Josephus, we see that Paul is hardly as bad.

HUBBARD (2891l) cites several common themes between Josephus and Luke, notably that divine providence favored Rome (to be seen particularly in Gamaliel's speech in the Lukan Book of Acts 5. 33–39); that the Jewish revolutionaries have disregarded their own ethical standards (so Acts 2. 23, 3. 14–15, 5. 30, 7. 51–52, 13. 28); and that the revolutionaries received what they deserved (see Luke 19. 41–44, 23. 28–31, 21. 20). He concludes that Luke had to take as positive a stance as possible toward Rome in order to avoid further persecution; we may add that he may have been further motivated by the fact that Jesus had been put to death as “king of the Jews”, that is, as a revolutionary, and that he felt that he had to counteract this image.

SCHONFIELD (2891m), pp. 34–42, boldly concludes that the appearance of Josephus' ‘*Antiquities*’ suggested the need for a Christian statement concerning Christian beginnings on more historical lines than either Mark or Matthew, and that this need was fulfilled by Luke-Acts. It may well be, he further remarks, that the two-part Luke-Acts was inspired by the two-part ‘*Against Apion*’. If so, we may remark, we have a *terminus post quem* for Luke, whose date is usually given as between 85 and 95, but whose composition, according to this hypothesis, must date from the appearance of the ‘*Antiquities*’ in 93–94. We may, however, object that there is no clear allusion in either Luke or Acts to the ‘*Antiquities*’, let alone any polemic against statements made by Josephus. Moreover, the two parts of the work ‘*Against Apion*’ are related in a very different way from Luke's relation to Acts. SCHONFIELD asserts that Luke 2. 46–47 used Josephus as an ideal hunting-ground, and that the inspiration, for example, to



put in a story about the hero at the age of twelve (Luke 2. 41–51) is from Josephus' Life 9; we may remark, however, that similar stories about the precocity of the hero are told of Aeschines, Alexander, Apollonius of Rhodes, Augustus, Ovid, Nicolaus of Damascus, and Apollonius of Tyana. SCHONFIELD suggests, moreover, that Luke's parable of the ten minas (Luke 19. 11–27) was inspired by Josephus' account of Archelaus, who received sovereignty as ethnarch, with the promise that he would be made king by Augustus if he ruled well (Ant. 17. 317). We may, however, comment that the point of the parable is rather different, being concerned not with ruling but with profitable investment; in truth, substantially the same parable is told in Matthew 25. 14–30, and Matthew is regarded by most scholars as having been composed some time between 80 and 90, in any case before Josephus' 'Antiquities'. SCHONFIELD also declares that the account of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem via Samaria (Luke 9. 51–56) was inspired by Antiquities 18. 118; but there does not seem to be any distinctive point of comparison here. Finally, SCHONFIELD draws a comparison between the centurion who said that he was a man under authority, with soldiers under him (Luke 7. 1–10), and Josephus' narrative of Petronius (War 2. 195), who says that he too must obey the law of his master. We may remark that a similar tale, with a similar point, is found in Matthew 8. 5–10, which was most likely composed, as noted above, before the 'Antiquities'; moreover, there is a parallel not in the 'Antiquities' but in the 'War', hence it can hardly be said that Luke is reacting against the account in the 'Antiquities'. Finally, the point that an official must obey his superior is a commonplace.

GASQUE (2891n), pp. 104 and 280, argues that Josephus and Luke wrote independently of each other and that either Luke had not read Josephus or had forgotten what he had read. He also notes, p. 159, that the twofold address to his patron, Epaphroditus, by Josephus in the introductions to both books of 'Against Apion' (1. 1 and 2. 1) provides an almost exact parallel to Luke and Acts; but, we may comment, aside from the fact that the same person, Theophilus, is addressed in both Luke and Acts, just as Epaphroditus is addressed in both books of 'Against Apion', there is little else that is parallel.

COOK (2891o), pp. 26–27, suggests that Luke may have been led by Josephus to look upon the scribes in Mark 12. 28ff. as Pharisees, since Josephus (War 2. 163–166, Ant. 18. 12–17) deduced that a major point of difference between the Pharisees and the Sadducees was the doctrine of resurrection.

### 23.17: Parallels between Josephus and Other Books of the New Testament

- (2892) LÉON HERRMANN: Les premiers exorcismes juifs et judéo-chrétiens. In: *Revue de l'Université de Bruxelles* 7, 1954–55, pp. 305–308.
- (2893) NORBERT KRIEGER: Ein Mensch in weichen Kleidern. In: *Novum Testamentum* 1, 1956, pp. 228–230.
- (2894) HUGH W. MONTEFIORE: Josephus and the New Testament. In: *Novum Testamentum* 4, 1960, pp. 139–160, 307–318. Rpt. London 1962 (*Contemporary Studies in Theology*, 6).

- (2895) GEORGE D. KILPATRICK: What John Tells Us about John. In: *Studies in John Presented to Professor Dr. Jan N. Sevenster on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday* (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 24). Leiden 1970. Pp. 75–87.
- (2896) STANISLAS GIET: La 'Guerre des Juifs' de Flavius Josèphe et quelques énigmes de l'Apocalypse. In: *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 26, 1952, pp. 1–29.
- (2897) STANISLAS GIET: Les épisodes de la Guerre juive et l'Apocalypse. In: *Revue des Sciences Religieuses* 26, 1952, pp. 325–362.
- (2898) STANISLAS GIET: L'Apocalypse et l'histoire: Étude historique sur l'Apocalypse johannique. Paris 1957.
- (2898a) ERNEST BAMMEL: 'Ex illa itaque die consilium fecerunt . . .' In: ERNEST BAMMEL, ed., *Festschrift Charles F. D. Moule*. London 1970. Pp. 11–40.
- (2898b) OTFRIED HOFIUS: Das 'erste' und das 'zweite' Zelt. Ein Beitrag zur Auslegung von Hbr 9, 1–10. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 61, 1970, pp. 271–277.
- (2898c) JOHN J. GUNTHER: St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background. A Study of Apocalyptic and Jewish Sectarian Teachings (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 35). Leiden 1973.
- (2898d) GEORGE W. BUCHANAN: The Use of Rabbinic Literature for New Testament Research. In: *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 7, 1977, pp. 110–122.
- (2898e) MICHAEL J. COOK: Mark's Treatment of the Jewish Leaders (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, 51). Leiden 1978.
- (2898f) HEINRICH BAARLINK: Zur Frage nach dem Antijudaismus im Markusevangelium. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 70, 1979, pp. 166–193.

HERRMANN (2892) finds a similarity in the drugs used in the exorcisms mentioned in Mark 9. 38, Acts 16. 16–19 and 19. 11–20 with those of the War 7. 185 and Antiquities 8. 45–49; but there is no basis for his conclusion that Christian exorcisms were earlier.

KRIEGER (2893) asserts that Matthew's allusion (11. 8) to the man clothed in soft raiment in king's houses is an ironic allusion to John's presence at the court of Herod Antipas.

MONTEFIORE (2894) seeks to establish a connection between a star and comet foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem mentioned by Josephus (War 6. 289) and similar phenomena mentioned by Matthew 2. 1–13; seventy-four years intervened between these events, and their connection appears to be dubious. MONTEFIORE also seeks, though unsuccessfully, a parallel for the rending of the Temple veil (Mark 15. 38, Matt. 27. 51, Luke 23. 44) in the spontaneous opening of the Temple gate (War 6. 293), for the resurrection in the fact that, within a day or two of the resurrection, a cow gave birth to a lamb in the midst of the court of the Temple (War 6. 292), for the ascension in the fact that chariots were seen in the air approximately forty days after the resurrection (War 6. 296–299), and for Pentecost in the voice that was heard in the Temple (War 6. 299). MONTEFIORE suggests the unlikely hypothesis that the traditions represented by Josephus were the result of a successful attempt to shift the context of these strange occurrences from their rightful place in Christian origins to the Roman-Jewish conflict. But the fact that Josephus is here supported, on the whole, by Tacitus, *Histories* 5. 13, argues strongly that Montefiore is incorrect.

KILPATRICK (2895), as a result of a sample study comparing John with the Septuagint, Philo, and Josephus for words starting with  $\alpha$  to  $\delta$ , notes that of

these words 32 are not found in Josephus but 73 are not found in Philo. Such a comparison, we may suggest, should take into account the total number of words in the works being compared, as well as the subject matter, to be of real significance.

GIET (2896) asserts that Josephus' treatment of Nero illuminates Revelation 13. 1–14 and 17. 7–14, where the beast alluded to is Nero. GIET (2897) says that the Jewish War was still very vivid in the mind of the author of the Book of Revelation and conjectures, though without any real evidence, that Josephus' 'War' was used by him. GIET (2898) seeks to find allusions to the Jewish War in Revelation, chapters 4–11, 13, and 17; but he is not convincing.

BAMMEL (2898a), pp. 21–25, cites a number of passages from Josephus – War 2. 237–238, 321 ff., 353, 400, 421; 5. 345, 6. 301; Ant. 14. 169, 15. 3, 18. 8, 19. 331 ff. – in his explanation of John 11. 45–57 on the theme of Jews being urged by their leaders to submit to the Romans. He notes that in Josephus the words are addressed to those who endanger temple and nation by their rash action, whereas in John the remarks are made in a session *in camera* among those who are basically of the same opinion. The argument, he concludes, is to be taken either as based on vague memory or as deriving from a different source.

HOFIUS (2898b), in his exegesis of Hebrews 9. 1–10, where there is a description of the Temple, cites Josephus' descriptions in Books 5 and 6 of the 'War'.

GUNTHER (2898c) comments on the parallels between Paul's epistles and Jewish legalism, angelology, messianism, pneumatology, apocalypticism, mysticism, Gnosticism, and apostolic authority, and concludes that Paul's opponents are nearer to Essenes than to any other school.

BUCHANAN (2898d) declares that the fact that the story of the announcement to Pharaoh of the birth of Moses is found in Antiquities 2. 205–209 means that it is possible that it was known to the author of the Gospel of Matthew and may have provided the inspiration or details used in the birth narrative of Jesus.

COOK (2898e), p. 88, remarks that Josephus' use of γραμματεὺς ("secretary", "clerk") does not parallel that of the Gospels of Mark or Luke.

BAARLINK (2898f) cites approvingly MONTEFIORE's (2894) article. The significance of the tearing of the curtain in the Temple is that this marks the end of Israel's prerogative and that salvation is now open to all peoples.

## 24: Proselytes and 'Sympathizers'

### 24.0: Proselytes in Josephus: General

- (2899) BERNARD J. BAMBERGER: Proselytism in the Talmudic Period. Cincinnati 1939; rpt. New York 1969.
- (2900) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Jewish 'Sympathizers' in Classical Literature and Inscriptions. In: Transactions of the American Philological Association 81, 1950, pp. 200–208.
- (2901) HARRY J. LEON: The Jews of Ancient Rome. Philadelphia 1960.
- (2902) ERNST LERLE: Proselytenwerbung und Urchristentum. Berlin 1960.
- (2903) KARL G. KUHN and HARTMUT STEGEMANN: Proselyten. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Supplement 9, 1962, cols. 1248–1283.
- (2904) L. H. DAVIS: Attitudes and Policies toward Gentiles during the Maccabean Period. In: Yavneh Review 4. 1, 1965, pp. 5–20.
- (2905) SALO W. BARON: Population. In: Encyclopaedia Judaica 13, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 866–903.
- (2906) URIEL RAPAPORT: Jewish Religious Propaganda and Proselytism in the Period of the Second Commonwealth (in Hebrew). Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1965.
- (2907) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Proselytes and Proselytism during the Second Commonwealth and the Early Tannaitic Period. In: SAUL LIEBERMAN et al., edd., Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume, English Section 2, Jerusalem 1965, pp. 871–881.
- (2908) ENIO A. FONDA: A Diaspora Judaica em Roma, das Origens até Nero. In: Revista de Historia (São Paulo) 39. 79, 1969, pp. 39–50; 40. 81, 1970, pp. 37–49.
- (2909) MOSES ABERBACH: The Roman-Jewish War (66–70 A.D.). Its Origin and Consequences. London 1966.
- (2910) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965.
- (2911) ERNEST L. ABEL: Were the Jews Banished from Rome in 19 A.D.? In: Revue des Études juives 127, 1968, pp. 383–386.
- (2911a) GERHARD KITTEL: Das Konnubium mit den Nichtjuden im antiken Judentum: In: Forschungen zur Judenfrage (Hamburg) 2, 1937, pp. 30–62.
- (2911b) I(SAAK) HEINEMANN: The Attitude of the Ancients toward Judaism (in Hebrew). In: Zion 4, 1938–39, pp. 269–293.
- (2911c) JACOB S. RAISIN: Gentile Reactions to Jewish Ideals. With Special Reference to Proselytes. New York 1953.
- (2911d) DAVID DAUBE: The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism. London 1956.
- (2911e) GEORGE R. BEASLEY-MURRAY: Baptism in the New Testament. London 1962. Trans. into German: Die christliche Taufe. Eine Untersuchung über ihr Verständnis in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Kassel 1968.
- (2911f) HEINRICH KASTING: Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission. Eine historische Untersuchung (Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie; theologische Abhandlungen, Bd. 55; issued also as thesis, Göttingen 1966). München 1969.
- (2911g) ELISABETH SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA: Miracles, Mission, and Apologetics: An Introduc-

- tion. In: ELISABETH SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA, ed., *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Notre Dame 1976. Pp. 1–25.
- (2911h) MORTON SMITH: *Rome and Maccabean Conversions: Notes on I Macc. 8*. In: *Festschrift David Daube*. Oxford 1978. Pp. 1–7.
- (2911i) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Proselytism and Syncretism*. In: MENAHEM STERN, ed., *The Jewish Diaspora in the Second Temple Period (World History of the Jewish People, Second Temple Period, vol. 4)*. In press.
- (2911j) MARCEL SIMON: *Sur les débuts du prosélytisme juif*. In: *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*. Paris 1971. Pp. 509–520.
- (2911k) JOSEPH R. ROSENBLUM: *Conversion to Judaism: From the Biblical Period to the Present*. Cincinnati 1978.

BAMBERGER (2899), p. 21–22, has a list and a brief discussion of the various references to Jewish proselytes and proselyting in Josephus.

I (2900) have noted that Josephus frequently stresses the eagerness with which the Jews welcomed proselytes during this period. LEON (2901), pp. 250–256, in his general survey of Jewish proselytism in Rome, particularly as seen in the inscriptions in the Jewish catacombs, agrees.

LERLE (2902), pp. 34–36, comments on the requirements for conversion in Josephus, the number of converts, and the reasons for conversion; in this last connection he says that the desire to be free from military service played a certain role; but we may comment that there is no evidence for this, that in fact many Jews served in armies, and that significantly none of the many enemies of the Jews attacks them for seeking such an escape.

KUHN and STEGEMANN (2903) stress that despite Josephus' statement (Against Apion 2. 209–210) that Judaism ungrudgingly welcomes sincere converts, in practice the Jews were less positively disposed, as is seen, for example, in their attitude toward the Herodian royal house. We may comment that it is hardly justified to generalize on the basis of the attitude of the Jews toward the hated Herod; moreover, their objection to him was compounded by the fact that his assumption of the kingship apparently violated the Torah (Deuteronomy 17. 15), which specifically requires that a king be a born Jew, while the Talmud (Baba Bathra 3b) declares that he was a slave of the Has-monean house.

DAVIS (2904) contends that the broad masses of the Jews harbored neither missionary zeal nor excessive hatred toward the Gentile population of Palestine and Transjordan. We may comment that we must differentiate between neighborly relations between Jews and Gentiles and missionary zeal, that Josephus, who is our chief source, gives us almost no information about the attitude of the broad masses; but to judge from the fact that in 'Against Apion', where he cites so many anti-Semitic charges, he does not refer to any statement that the Jews had changed their attitude toward proselyting and the fact, admittedly only a good guess, that by the middle of the first century, according to BARON (2905), pp. 870–871, for example, the population of the Jews of Palestine had grown from about 60,000–70,000 after the Babylonian captivity in 538 to about 2,350,000–2,500,000 before the fall of Jerusalem in 70, the Jews must have been eager missionaries. Indeed, if the figures are at all accurate, such an increase can

be accounted for only by assuming large-scale conversions during at least a good part of this period.

RAPAPORT (2006), in a thorough survey, suggests that the hostility between the Greek and the native Oriental population of Palestine led the latter to side with the Jews in the war between the Hasmoneans and the Hellenistic cities. He thus explains the mass conversions in Idumaea and Galilee. We may comment that Josephus, who should have preferred this explanation to the embarrassment of forced conversion, says (Ant. 13. 258) that John Hyrcanus gave the Idumaeans a choice of accepting circumcision or of being expelled from their land, and that it was only out of attachment to their ancestral land that they submitted to circumcision. Similarly, he says (Ant. 13. 318–319), Aristobulus conquered part of Ituraea and compelled the inhabitants to become Jews if they wished to remain in their country. We may further comment that in Egypt, where there was similarly enmity between the Greek-Macedonian population and the native Egyptians, the natives were sharply opposed to the Jews, and that in Palestine itself during the first century there were a number of debates between the Jews and the other Oriental nations. If we seek an explanation of the tremendous zeal and success of Jewish proselyting, we may suggest that just as the Athenians after the Persian Wars felt inspired by their unexpected and glorious response to the tremendous Persian challenge, so the successful response to the Syrian challenge gave impetus to the Hasmoneans in their expansion.

ZEITLIN (2007) cites War 7. 45 and Antiquities 14. 110 as evidence of the widespread character of Jewish missionary activity.

FONDA (2008) presents a survey, generally critical of Josephus's evidence, of anti-Semitism and of Jewish proselytism at Rome.

ABERBACH (2009) stresses as one of the major sources of friction between the Jews and the Romans the extraordinary success of Jewish missionary propaganda. We may comment that if, indeed, this had been so, the Romans should have enacted, or least have attempted to enact, decrees forbidding proselyting by Jews, but we do not hear of them until after the Bar Kochba rebellion under Hadrian. There is only one attempt after 139 B.C.E. to stop proselyting by Jews at Rome, and that is the expulsion of four thousand Jews from Rome in 19 C.E. in the aftermath of the swindling by Jewish embezzlers of the noble proselyte Fulvia (Ant. 18. 81–84; cf. Suetonius, Tiberius 36, Dio Cassius 57, 18. 5a, Tacitus, Annals 2. 85). In view of the fact that the person swindled was a proselyte, Dio's reason for the expulsion, namely the fact that the Jews were converting so many Romans to their faith, seems plausible, as LEON (2001), pp. 17–19, and I (2010), pp. 60–61, have suggested. But this was an isolated incident, and the banishment was clearly of short duration, being connected with the evil machinations of Tiberius' minister Sejanus; and as soon as Sejanus was put to death for his conspiracy in 31, Tiberius restored the rights of the Jews (Philo, Legatio ad Gaium 160).

Moreover, ABEL (2011) plausibly argues that it was only proselytes who were expelled, since Tiberius, who was careful to obey the letter of the law, would have avoided banishing any citizen without a trial.

KITTEL (2911a), in an essay marred by anti-Semitism, discusses Josephus as a source for the Jewish proselyting movement.

HEINEMANN (2911b) concludes, basing himself to a considerable degree upon Josephus, that the Jews, to a certain extent, spread their faith for religious reasons, but that frequently there were also political motives. He notes the hatred of Jews generated by proselytism and self-segregation.

RAISIN (2911c), pp. 317–319, has a brief summary of Josephus as an apologist for Judaism and for Jewish proselytism.

DAUBE (2911d), pp. 138–140, notes the striking similarity in structure between the order of instruction to be given to proselytes according to the Talmud (Yevamoth 47a) – the test, the commandments, charity, penalties, reward and the World to Come – and that in Josephus (Apion 2. 190 ff.), except that Josephus has no reference to a test, since he is not dealing with an actual applicant, and except that instead of a special part on charity within the community he has one on humanity to aliens, enemies, and beasts. The fact, moreover, that though Josephus composed his work 'Against Apion' a considerable time after the fall of the Temple and yet writes as if it stood indicates dependence upon earlier models. We may reply that this is not necessarily so, since for Josephus, a priest who had served in it, the Temple was still very vivid even after its fall.

BEASLEY-MURRAY (2911e), pp. 19–20, concludes from the fact that Josephus never mentions proselyte baptism, even in his long account of the conversion of the Adiabeniensians, that it was not practiced, but that by late in the first century it had been established as a rite of conversion. He comments on Josephus' silence concerning baptism of proselytes. We may remark that Josephus is a historian rather than a systematic theologian, and that hence his silence is not particularly significant.

KASTING (2911f), pp. 11–23, has a survey of the spread of Judaism in this period.

FIORINZA (2911g) comments on Josephus' reports concerning Jewish missionary activities within the context of mission and apologetics in Judaism during this period.

SMITH (2911h) suggests that the explanation for the Maccabean policy of compulsory conversion of conquered populations to Judaism is that it was an imitation of the Romans, who had become a great nation only after the forcible extension of their citizenship. In addition, the converts would defend the king from his pious subjects. We may, however, comment that the history of the last century of the Roman republic is a history of reluctance in the extension of citizenship; as a matter of fact, the Italian allies of the Romans took up arms in the Social War (90–88 B.C.E.) because the Roman Senate had refused to entertain their renewed demand for citizenship. As to the notion that by gaining converts the Hasmoneans were swelling the ranks of those who would defend them, we may remark that forced converts might well resent those who had converted them under duress.

I (2911i) frequently cite Josephus on the presumptive evidence of the extent of proselytism, converts in various lands of the Diaspora, reasons for the success

of the missionary movement, the methods of the missionaries, motives of proselytes, rites of conversion, the status of proselytes and the attitude of born Jews toward them.

SIMON (2911j) comments on the significance of the fact that the term *προσηλύτος* is absent from Josephus and suggests that a shift took place in the conception of the mission of the Jews, that is, to obtain 'sympathizers' rather than proselytes.

ROSENBLOOM (2911k) comments on Josephus' concern (Apion 2. 210) to explain Judaism to non-Jews, in contrast to the parochialism of the Greeks (Apion 2. 261). He also discusses, pp. 94–96, the forcible conversion of the Idumaeans and of the Ituraeans and notes ZEITLIN's view that the Idumaeans, who played such an important role in aiding the revolution, were co-religionists of the Jews but remained a separate but related nation. We may comment that if this were so, we would have expected Josephus, who regarded them as one of the five major revolutionary groups (War 7. 267), to have mentioned this in order to discredit them; and he makes no such statement.

#### 24.1: The Conversion of King Izates of Adiabene to Judaism (see also 15.21)

- (2912) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Selected Literature on the Conversion of King Izates and the Adiabeneans to Judaism (Ant. xx. 17–96). Appendix R. In: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965. P. 586.
- (2913) BERNARD J. BAMBERGER: Proselytism in the Talmudic Period. Cincinnati 1939; rpt. New York 1969.
- (2914) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: From Jesus to Paul, 2 vols. (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1939–40. Trans. into English by WILLIAM STINESPRING: New York 1943; rpt. 1979. Trans. into German by FRIEDRICH THIEBERGER: Von Jesus zu Paulus. Jerusalem 1950.
- (2915) JACOB NEUSNER: The Conversion of Adiabene to Judaism. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 83, 1964, pp. 60–66.
- (2916) JACOB NEUSNER: A History of the Jews in Babylonia. Vol. I: The Parthian Period. Leiden 1965; 2nd ed., 1969.
- (2917) FRANZ ALTHEIM and RUTH STIEHL: Jüdische Mission unter den Arabern. In their: Die Araber in der Alten Welt. Vol. 2. Berlin 1965. Pp. 64–75.
- (2918) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Proselytes and Proselytism during the Second Commonwealth and the Early Tannaitic Period. In: SAUL LIEBERMAN et al., edd., Harry Austryn Wolfson Jubilee Volume. English Section. Vol. 2. Jerusalem 1965. Pp. 871–881.
- (2918a) HEINRICH KASTING: Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission. Eine historische Untersuchung (Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie; theologische Abhandlungen, Bd. 55; issued also as thesis, Göttingen 1966). München 1969.
- (2918b) JOSEPH R. ROSENBLOOM: Conversion to Judaism: From the Biblical Period to the Present. Cincinnati 1978.

I (2912) have a brief bibliography on this subject.

BAMBERGER (2913), pp. 48–52, says that the divergence between Ananias (Hananiah), who (Ant. 20. 40–42) advised Izates not to be circumcised, and Eleazar (Ant. 20. 43), who urged him to carry out the rite, was not a matter of dispute between Hillel and Shammai but rather a matter of expediency vs.



principle. It is not the same as the dispute (Yevamoth 46a) between Rabbi Joshua ben Ḥananiah (we may wonder about the coincidence of the name Ḥananiah in a similar view), who declared that one who is baptized but not circumcised is a convert, and Rabbi Eliezer, who held that one who is circumcised but not baptized is a convert. Rather, says BAMBERGER, the question at issue was whether circumcision is like other commandments in that it may be omitted when it involves physical danger. We may comment that the fact that Ananias in Josephus says that G-d would pardon Izates "if, constrained thus by necessity and by fear of his subjects", he failed to perform the rite, indicates that he regarded circumcision as necessary but that under these circumstances, involving danger to his life, he felt that it should be omitted, just as, for example, when a person has hemophilia. See my note (2912), pp. 410–411. BAMBERGER, pp. 225–228, summarizes the accounts of the conversion of the royal family of Adiabene in Josephus and in the Midrash and concludes, with more diffidence than necessary, that the resemblances, including the initial omission of circumcision, are more significant than the discrepancies.

KLAUSNER (2914), pp. 37–40, comments particularly on the conversion of Izates, and says that the controversy between Ananias and Eleazar (= Joshua ben Ḥananiah vs. Eliezer) is reflected also in the dispute between Paul and Barnabas, on the one hand, and James and Peter, on the other hand, as to whether circumcision is necessary in the case of pagans who accept Christianity or whether baptism alone is sufficient. We may comment that Ananias clearly implies that circumcision is required as a rule except in cases of danger, as here in the instance of Izates, whereas Paul and Barnabas do not present the factor of danger as the determining one.

NEUSNER (2915)(2916), pp. 58–64, suggests that the conversions of Queen Helena and of King Izates were not only religiously but also politically motivated, that the Adiabeniens hoped thereby to assume the leadership of the Near East by forming the capstone of an international Jewish alliance, and that the Adiabeniens king hoped for the Jewish throne if the Jews should be successful in the revolution against Rome. In reply, while we must admit that it is tempting to look for political motives in conversions of kings such as Constantine, Izates, whose utter piety is clear both in Josephus and in the Midrash, could hardly have hoped to become king of the land of Israel, since the Bible (Deuteronomy 17. 15) says that the king must be "one from your brethren", which the Talmud interprets to mean a born Jew. That this law was clearly meaningful at this time is to be seen from the rabbinic passage (Mishnah, Sotah 7. 8) that when Agrippa I reached this passage (Deuteronomy 17. 15) he burst into tears, presumably because he was part-Edomite.

ALTHEIM and STIEHL (2917), utilizing Iranian, Armenian, and Talmudic sources, suggest that Izates and Monobazus, his older brother, who was also converted to Judaism, bore Iranian names.

ZEITLIN (2918), pp. 175–176, argues from the story of Izates in Josephus' 'Antiquities' that originally a proselyte did not have to undergo particular rites to be converted. We may reflect that even Ananias justifies the omission of the rite only because he felt that performing it might lead to an attempt at assassina-

tion of the king. The citation of the rabbinic Sifra 1. 111 that whoever denies idol worship recognizes the whole Torah is hardly proof but is merely the Talmud's way of indicating the importance of the matter. We may cite as one of many examples of similar extreme language the statement that "Whoever robs his fellow-man of even what is worth a penny is as though he had taken his life from him" (Baba Kamma 119a).

KASTING (2918a), pp. 22–27, deals with the conversion of the Adiabeniens and stresses that Ananias' motive in urging Izates not to be circumcised was dictated not by religious considerations but by fear.

ROSENBLUM (2918b), pp. 97–100, following NEUSNER (2915), stresses that the motive of the rulers of Adiabene in converting to Judaism was to form a hegemony based on national alliances bolstered by religious ties.

## 24.2: Jewish 'Sympathizers' in Josephus

- (2919) ROBERT H. PFEIFFER: History of New Testament Times. New York 1949.
- (2920) OTTO KARRER: Urchristliche Zeugen: das Urchristentum nach den außerbiblischen Dokumenten bis 150 n. Chr. Innsbruck 1937.
- (2921) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: From Jesus to Paul, 2 vols. (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1939–40. Trans. into English by WILLIAM STINESPRING: New York 1943; rpt. 1979. Trans. into German by FRIEDRICH THIEBERGER: Von Jesus zu Paulus. Jerusalem 1950.
- (2922) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Jewish 'Sympathizers' in Classical Literature and Inscriptions. In: Transactions of the American Philological Association 81, 1950, pp. 200–208.
- (2923) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: The Alleged Jewish Tendencies of Poppaea Sabina. In: Journal of Theological Studies 10, 1959, pp. 329–335.
- (2924) RALPH MARCUS: The *Sebomenoi* in Josephus. In: Jewish Social Studies 14, 1952, pp. 247–250.
- (2925) HARRY J. LEON: The Jews of Ancient Rome. Philadelphia 1960.
- (2926) LOUIS ROBERT: Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes. Paris 1964.
- (2927) MENAHEM STERN: Sympathy for Judaism in Roman Senatorial Circles in the Period of the Early Empire (in Hebrew). In: Zion 29, 1964, pp. 155–167.
- (2928) BARUCH LIFSHITZ: Du nouveau sur les 'Sympathisants'. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period 1, 1970, pp. 77–84.
- (2929) MORTON SMITH: Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament. New York 1971.
- (2930) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 2, The Jewish War, Books I–III (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1927.
- (2931) FOLKER SIEGERT: Gottesfürchtige und Sympathisanten. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period 4, 1973, pp. 109–164.
- (2932) ARTHUR D. NOCK: Conversion: The Old and New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo. Oxford 1933.
- (2932a) GERHARD DELLING: Die Altarschrift eines Gottesfürchtigen in Pergamon. In: Novum Testamentum 7, 1964, pp. 73–80.
- (2932b) HEINRICH KASTING: Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission. Eine historische Untersuchung (Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie; theologische Abhandlungen, Bd. 55; issued also as thesis, Göttingen 1966). München 1969.
- (2932c) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Proselytism and Syncretism. In: MENAHEM STERN, ed., The Jewish Diaspora in the Second Temple Period (World History of the Jewish People, Second Temple Period, vol. 4). In press.

(2932d) GIUSEPPE SCARPAT: *Il pensiero religioso di Seneca e l'ambiente ebraico e cristiano* (Antichità classica e cristiana, 14). Brescia 1977.

Poppaea Sabina, the wife of Nero, is termed θεοσεβής ("G-d-fearer") by Josephus (Ant. 20. 195), and she is consequently usually identified, for example by PFEIFFER (2919), p. 195, as a 'sympathizer' with Judaism, that is, one who observed certain Jewish practices and held certain Jewish beliefs without actually becoming a proselyte.

KARRER (2920), pp. 120–127, however, terms Poppaea a Jewish proselyte and says that she was probably goaded by Josephus to hate the Christians and to blame them for the fire in Rome in 64. We may comment that when he speaks of converts, Josephus uses different language, and that in any case he never speaks of the fire, let alone placing the blame on the Christians, or of Poppaea being goaded to hate them.

KLAUSNER (2921), p. 43, compares Poppaea with the Roman senator who was a "G-d-fearing man" and who, according to the Midrash Deuteronomy Rabbah on 2. 24, committed suicide so as to nullify a decree against the Jews. But, we may comment, the senator is called a G-d-fearing man even before it is learned that he actually had been circumcised shortly before his death; and the term there used is a technical term for 'sympathizer', whereas the term θεοσεβής, "worshipper of G-d", which is here used, does not necessarily identify Poppaea as a sympathizer in this technical sense, as I (2922) have noted. We may add that in his Life 16, Josephus speaks of his being introduced to Poppaea through Aliturus, an actor who was a special favorite of Nero and who was of Jewish origin; but he significantly says nothing of Poppaea herself being a proselyte to or a sympathizer with Judaism.

SMALLWOOD (2923) follows me in asserting that the term θεοσεβής does not mean that Poppaea was a Judaizer but merely that she was religious. She asks how Poppaea, as an empress, could have fulfilled the fundamental requirement of Judaism, the repudiation of idolatry, without creating a stir in Rome; but, as we have suggested, there is no indication here that Poppaea had become a proselyte or that becoming a 'sympathizer' necessarily involved the repudiation of idolatry.

I (2922) have suggested that when Josephus (Ant. 14. 110) uses the term σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν, he refers not to the class of pagans who showed their 'sympathy' for Judaism by following certain Jewish practices but rather to pious Jews. This is disputed on grammatical grounds by MARCUS (2924); but, we may comment, Josephus is far from consistent in his Greek grammar, and the fact that the term does not have this meaning in certain passages in the New Testament and elsewhere which I cite argues against MARCUS.

LEON (2925), pp. 250–252, adopts my view that the term σεβόμενοι is not the technical term for "sympathizers" but may be applied to pious Jews as well. My view is also adopted by ROBERT (2926).

STERN (2927) notes that sympathy for Judaism spread to higher social circles, especially three families of Roman senators – the Petronii, the Vitellii, and the Plautii.

LIFSHITZ (1928) follows MARCUS against me in his interpretation of Antiquities 14. 110 and says that Josephus, the New Testament, and inscriptions do attest to the existence of semi-proselytes, but he agrees with me that each case must be judged on its own merits.

SMITH (1929), p. 239, notes that Josephus (War 2. 463) speaks of Judaizers (i.e. sympathizers) in Syria who aroused suspicion on the part of non-Jews. He properly notes that THACKERAY (1930), p. 503, incorrectly translates, "They [i.e. the Syrians] feared these neutrals (μεμιγμένον) as much as pronounced aliens". The correct translation for μεμιγμένον is "a person of mixed stock", a reference to the mixed population of Syria at the time of the revolt in 66; and SMITH concludes that there was fusion of the Israelites with the surrounding peoples.

SIEGERT (1931), who presents a systematic examination of all passages referring to G-d-fearers, distinguishes between G-d-fearers who were seriously interested in the Jewish religion but who were not members of synagogue communities and were not necessarily monotheists, on the one hand, and sympathizers who adopted some Jewish practices or were politically sympathetic to the Jews, on the other hand. The existence of G-d-fearers, he says, was due to the impossibility of changing one's religion completely and the willingness of Jewish missionaries to compromise. Halakhically, we may comment, there is no such thing as a partial proselyte, and such people continued to be regarded as pagans. We may add that the degree of sympathy may be seen not by the terminology used but by the context in each individual case. It was certainly possible, though of course difficult, to change one's life-style completely during this period, though we know of many cases of such conversions not only to Judaism but also to other religions and quasi-religions or philosophies, as NOCK (1932) has carefully shown. As for the willingness of Jewish missionaries to compromise, there is little evidence of this; and to judge from the case of Eleazar in Adiabene, there was good reason for willingness occasionally to compromise, namely sheer fear.

DELLING (1932a) comments on an altar-inscription dedicated to the Jewish L-rd (Κυρίῳ) and believes that it refers to 'Sympathizers'.

KASTING (1932b), p. 27, asserts that a φοβούμενος or a σεβόμενος is not a 'sympathizer' but a pious person, and that Acts 13. 43, which speaks of τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων, confirms this, since the reference is to pious proselytes.

I (1932c) discuss 'Sympathizers' with Judaism in Magna Graecia and Greece, Egypt, Syria, Asia Minor, Adiabene, Persia, and Rome, as well as the practices of the 'Sympathizers', the Rabbinic attitude toward 'Sympathizers', and syncretism.

SCARPAT (1932d) discusses the θεοσεβεῖς at Rome.

## 25: Josephus and Archaeology

### 25.0: Josephus and the Geography, Topography, and Archaeology of the Land of Israel: General

- (2933) MILKA CASSUTO-SALZMANN: Selected Bibliography. Publications on Archaeological Excavations and Surveys in Israel. 1948–1958; 1959–1963; Jan. 1964–June 1967; July 1967–Dec. 1971. In: *ʿAtiqot* 2, 1959, pp. 165–183; 3, 1961, pp. 188–189; 8, Supplement 1969, pp. 1–29; 9–10, Supplement 1973, pp. 1–54.
- (2934) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Map of Roman Palestine. In: *Quarterly of Department of Antiquities in Palestine*, vol. 5, Oxford 1936, pp. 139–193; 2nd ed., Jerusalem 1940.
- (2935) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: *Géographie de la Palestine*. 2 vols. Paris 1933–38; 3rd ed., 1967.
- (2936) ARNOLD H. M. JONES: *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*. Oxford 1937; 2nd ed. (revised by MICHAEL AVI-YONAH et al.), 1971.
- (2937) ISIAH PRESS: *Eretz Israel: A Topographical-Historical Encyclopaedia of Palestine* (in Hebrew). 4 vols. Jerusalem 1946–55. Trans. into English: Jerusalem 1948–55.
- (2938) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, SAMUEL YEIVIN, and MOSHE STEKELIS: *Antiquities of Our Land* (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Tel-Aviv 1955.
- (2939) GEORGE ERNEST WRIGHT: *Biblical Archaeology*. Philadelphia 1957; revised ed., 1962.
- (2940) JAN J. SIMONS: *The Geographical and Topographical Texts of the Old Testament: A Concise Commentary in XXXII Chapters*. Leiden 1959.
- (2941) ZECHARIAH KALLAI (KLEINMANN): *The Biblical Geography of Josephus* (in Hebrew). In: CHAIM RABIN and YIGAL YADIN, edd., Eliezer L. Sukenik Memorial Volume (= *Ha-ḥevrah leḥakirat Erez-Yisrael, Erez Yisrael: Meḥkarim beyidiʿat ha-arez ve-ʿatikoteha*, vol. 8). Jerusalem 1967. Pp. 269–272.
- (2942) MENAHEM STERN: *The Description of Palestine by Pliny the Elder and the Administrative Division of Judea at the End of the Period of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiṣ* 37, 1967–68, pp. 215–229.
- (2943) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *Palaestina*. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Supplementband 13, 1973, cols. 321–454.
- (2944) ALBRECHT ALT: *Galiläische Probleme*. In: *Palästinajahrbuch* 33, 1937, pp. 52–88; 34, 1938, pp. 80–93; 35, 1939, pp. 64–82; 36, 1940, pp. 78–92. Rpt. in his: *Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Vol. 2. München 1953. Pp. 363–435.
- (2945) SAMUEL KLEIN: *A Chapter in Palestine Research towards the End of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). In: JACOB N. EPSTEIN et al., edd., *Magnes Anniversary Book*. Jerusalem 1938. Pp. 216–223.
- (2946) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Alexander Yannai's Conquests in Moab* (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 1, 1951, pp. 104–121.
- (2947) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Die Eroberungen des Alexander Jannäus in Moab*. In: *Theokratia* 1, 1967–69, pp. 3–50.
- (2948) SAMUEL KLEIN: *The Land of Galilee* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1945.
- (2949) MENASHE HAR-EL: *The Zealots' Fortresses in Galilee*. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 22, 1972, pp. 123–130.

- (2950) SAMUEL KLEIN: *The Land of Judah from the Days of the Return from Babylonia to the Completion of the Talmud* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1939.
- (2951) ZECHARIAH KALLAI (KLEINMANN): *The Northern Boundaries of Judah from the Settlement of the Tribes until the Beginning of the Hasmonean Period* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1960.
- (2952) OTTO PLÖGER: *Die makkabäischen Burgen*. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 71, 1955, pp. 141–172.
- (2953) SIEGFRIED WIBBING: *Zur Topographie einzelner Schlachten des Judas Makkabäus*. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 78, 1962, pp. 159–170.
- (2954) CLEMENS KOPP: *Die heiligen Stätten der Evangelien*. Regensburg 1959.
- (2955) HANS BIETENHARD: *Die Dekapolis von Pompeius bis Traian. Ein Kapitel aus der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte*. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 79, 1963, pp. 24–58.
- (2956) HENDRIK VAN DER LOOS: *The Miracles of Jesus*. Leiden 1965, 1968.
- (2957) WALDEMAR HAUDE: *Über klimatische und menschliche Einwirkungen auf den Wasserhaushalt des Toten Meeres in seiner Vergangenheit*. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 88, 1972, pp. 105–139.
- (2957a) JACK FINEGAN: *The Archeology of the New Testament. The Life of Jesus and the Beginning of the Early Church*. Princeton 1969.
- (2957b) YORAM TSAFRIR: *The Desert Forts of Judea in Second Temple Times* (in Hebrew). In *Qadmoniot* 8, 1975, pp. 41–53.
- (2957c) CHRISTA MÖLLER and GÖTZ SCHMITT: *Siedlungen Palästinas nach Flavius Josephus* (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, ed. WOLFGANG RÖLLIG. Reihe B, Geisteswissenschaften, nr. 14). Wiesbaden 1976.
- (2957d) YISROEL ROLL: *The Roman Road Network in Eretz-Israel* (in Hebrew). In: *Qadmoniot* 9, 1976, pp. 38–50.
- (2957e) RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton 1976.
- (2957f) GLEN W. BOWERSOCK: *Syria-Palestine*. In: MOSES I. FINLEY, ed., *Atlas of Classical Archaeology*. London 1977. Pp. 220–237.
- (2957g) WOLFGANG ROTH: *Galilee before Jesus*. In: *Explor* 3, 1977, pp. 18–35.
- (2957h) URIEL RAPPAPORT: *The Hellenistic Cities on the Mediterranean Coast of Palestine* (in Hebrew). In: *Hof ve-yam: A Collection of Articles and Lectures*. Kibbutz Hameuhad 1978. Pp. 41–48.
- (2957i) YORAM TSAFRIR: *Fortresses of the Desert of Judah in the Days of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). In: DAVID AMIT, ed., *Fortresses of the Desert in the Days of the Second Temple*. 2nd ed., Kefar Etzion 1976. Pp. 3–12 (= rpt. of 2957b).
- (2957j) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and EPHRAIM STERN, edd.: *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land*. 4 vols. Jerusalem and Englewood Cliffs, 1975–78.
- (2957k) ERIC M. MEYERS, JAMES F. STRANGE, and DENNIS E. GROH: *The Meiron Excavation Project: Archaeological Survey in Galilee and Golan, 1976*. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 230, 1978, pp. 1–24.
- (2957l) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: *Gazeteer of Roman Palestine* (Qedem, 5). Jerusalem 1976.
- (2957m) JACK FINEGAN: *Archaeological History of the Ancient Middle East*. Boulder, Colorado 1979.

The discoveries of archaeologists in Israel and Jordan, particularly since the emergence of the State of Israel, where archaeology is almost the national hobby, have enabled the historian to check Josephus at many points.

CASSUTO-SALZMANN (2933) has presented a very generous selective bibliography. The items are arranged under four headings: general studies devoted to

special subjects, general surveys of archaeological activities, individual sites, and objects of unknown provenance.

AVI-YONAH (1934), in his huge map of Roman Palestine (1:100,000), identifying all place-names, natural features, and Roman remains, uses Josephus constantly as his guide.

ABEL (1935), pp. 125–140, cites Josephus constantly in discussing the divisions of Palestine during the Hellenistic period, and pp. 141–161, in discussing the geography of Palestine as part of the Roman province of Syria, especially during the Herodian period.

JONES (1936), pp. 227–296 and 445–468, contains a critical evaluation of the reports of Josephus with regard to the cities of the province of Syria.

PRESS (1937), who gives a critical view of the literary sources, presents a history of the settlements and the boundaries of the land of Israel. He concludes that Josephus had a profound knowledge of the geography of the land, since it was the place of his birth.

AVI-YONAH – YEIVIN – STEKELIS (1938) present a well-illustrated and diagrammed survey.

WRIGHT (1939), pp. 218–226 (pp. 221–229 in the revised edition), presents a clear, readable, and well-illustrated popular summary of the archaeological discoveries which directly illuminate Biblical history. Occasionally WRIGHT cites Josephus in confirmation, but he makes no systematic attempt to examine his accounts critically.

SIMONS (1940), in an encyclopaedia which is a true vademecum, cites Josephus often in his list of all the geographical names found in the Bible. He shows an excellent critical command of scholarship in the field, and, in particular, of archaeological finds.

I have not seen KALLAI (1941).

STERN (1942) concludes that the differences between Josephus (War 3. 54–58) and Pliny (Nat.Hist. 5. 14. 70) in the description of the geography of the land of Israel are not significant and that Pliny's division into toparchies basically reflects his source, which was contemporary with Herod, with some updating of details, whereas the division in Josephus' 'War' reflects the later age of the procurators, when the Idumaeon toparchies had been incorporated into Judaea.

AVI-YONAH (1943) presents an exhaustive survey of the historical geography of Palestine with constant co-ordination of the literary and archaeological evidence and with up-to-date bibliography.

ALT (1944) critically evaluates the relevant passages in Josephus in discussing the source of the name Galilee (pp. 363–374), the Assyrian province Megiddo and its later fate (pp. 374–384), the Hellenistic cities and district of Galilee (pp. 384–395), Galilee's relationship to Samaria and Judaea in Hellenistic times (pp. 396–407), the transformation of Galilee by the Hasmoneans (pp. 407–423), and the first steps of the organization of Galilee under Roman rule (pp. 423–435).

KLEIN (1945), the greatest modern student of the geography of the land of Israel, contends that Josephus' geographical descriptions, even of Galilee (War 3. 35–40, 3. 506–508), where he served as a general, were greatly influenced by

the geographical references in the midrashim of the sages, and that his geographical descriptions are similar in form to those found in the Greek historians. We may recall that SCHALIT (2946) (2947) has similarly argued that Josephus' list of the cities conquered by Alexander Jannaeus (Ant. 13. 397, 14. 18) in Moab was influenced by the Septuagint version of Isaiah (15. 4–9) and of Jeremiah (31. 5–8, 8. 34, 36). We may suggest that if Josephus' descriptions accord with those of the Midrashim, we need not assume that one is modelled on the other in a stylized way, but rather that they both reflect actual reality.

KLEIN (2948) lists, discusses, and identifies, in a scholarly and critical fashion, all the individual towns in Galilee, drawing chiefly on Josephus. He has chapters on Galilee in various periods, notably in Hasmonean times, under the Romans, and during the war against Rome. In his discussion (pp. 41–52) on Josephus in Galilee, he carefully co-ordinates the evidence of Josephus with that in rabbinic Agada.

HAR-EL (2949) convincingly discusses the factors, as described in War 2. 572, 2. 576, and Life 188, that led the Zealots to select specific locations for strongholds in Galilee and Gaulanitis – namely, proximity to fertile valleys and an adequate supply of food and water, distance from the Hellenized coast (which was hostile to the Jews), their formation into a line of defense against the non-Jewish Tyrian and Syrian population, the possibility of communication by signals, and their proximity to the Jewish Gaulanitis and the main roads leading to the large Jewish settlements of Babylonia.

KLEIN (2950) presents a historical geography of Judah, systematically presenting the names of all the towns therein, in which he is largely dependent on Josephus, particularly for the period (pp. 74–133) from Jonathan (135 B.C.E.) to the destruction of the Temple (70 C.E.). He is particularly useful for his critical view of Josephus as a source for Jerusalem and for the Temple.

KALLAI (2951) draws largely on Josephus for his discussion (pp. 80–106) of the northern boundary of Judah during the Second Commonwealth until the beginning of the Hasmonean period.

PLÖGER (2952) identifies the modern sites of Alexandreion, Hyrcania, Machaerus, Masada, and Herodium, co-ordinating the archaeological finds with Josephus.

WIBBING (2953) co-ordinates archaeology with Josephus in his attempt to identify the places where Judah the Maccabee fought, notably Beth-Zacharia, Adasa, and Berzetho.

KOPP (2954) co-ordinates Josephus and the Gospels in discussing the site of Capernaum (pp. 215–220), and relies on Josephus in identifying the sites of Bethsaida (pp. 233–235), Ephraim, and Jericho (pp. 310–315).

BIETENHARD (2955) presents a historical survey of the cities and topography of the Decapolis in which he considers, chiefly on the basis of Josephus, whether it belonged to Syria or Arabia, its role under Pompey, the Herodians, the Jewish War from 66 to 70, and Trajan, and its commerce and population.

VAN DER LOOS (2956), pp. 452–453, has a brief discussion, from a medicinal point of view, of Josephus' references to healing springs.



HAUDE (1957), using Josephus' evidence, discusses the length and breadth and the water-level of the Dead Sea in Roman times and, in particular, the length of a stade.

FINEGAN (1957a), pp. 44–49, has a systematic description of Galilee and of the rest of Palestine, based largely on Josephus.

TSAFRIR (1957b), containing archaeological and (largely from Josephus) literary data, has a popular survey of Alexandreion, Dok, Kipros, Hyrcania, Machaerus, Herodium, and Masada, noting the dates when they were built and their history. He concludes that the forts which he describes served, on the one hand, as security for the way and, on the other hand, for administration. They could also have been used as prisons and tombs.

MÖLLER and SCHMITT (1957c) present the first thorough, systematic identification and localization of places mentioned by Josephus. They omit, however, all Biblical names which appear in the first ten books of the 'Antiquities', unless Josephus indicates that he knew them in his own time. For each entry they give the modern identification of the site, the citations in Josephus and in other ancient writers (including the Septuagint, the Talmud and the Church Fathers), references in inscriptions and to an extensive secondary literature, and the date. There are several novel identifications.

ROLL (1957d), co-ordinating the evidence of archaeology with that of Josephus and the Talmudic corpus, comments on the routes travelled by the Roman armies during the Great Rebellion and in later periods.

STILLWELL (1957e) has numerous entries, some fairly extensive, summarizing the history and surveying the chief monuments of various sites in Palestine in the light of Josephus. Each entry has a brief but valuable bibliography.

BOWERSOCK (1957f) generally follows Josephus as he surveys Syria and Palestine, with one or two pages each on Antioch, Gerasa, Caesarea, Jerusalem, Masada, Petra, Ba'albek, Palmyra, and 'Avdat. Each entry has lavish illustrations, brief historical and cultural notes, an archaeological summary, and brief bibliography. We may wonder, however, why such important sites as Herodium and Jericho are omitted.

ROTH (1957g) notes that the task has only now been begun of analyzing Josephus' writings and comparing them with archaeological findings so as to draw a more precise and differentiated picture of the Galilaean reaction to Roman rule.

RAPPAPORT (1957h) has a popular geographical and political survey, especially of strife between Jews and non-Jews in the coastal cities, which is chiefly dependent upon Josephus.

TSAFRIR (1957i), pp. 3–12, briefly surveys the fortresses in the Judean Desert during the period of the Second Temple.

AVI-YONAH and STERN (1957j), in an exhaustive and lavishly illustrated work, describe the various sites, the excavations, the artifacts discovered, and their significance. The work is replete with photographs, charts, maps, diagrams, and chronological tables.

MEYERS, STRANGE, and GROH (2957k) describe twenty sites in Galilee and the Golan Heights that they visited and discuss the importance of the discoveries for the history of the Hellenistic-Roman period.

AVI-YONAH (2957l) very frequently cites Josephus (though he is not always exhaustive in listing primary sources) in reconstructing the original form of place-names in Palestine and in identifying the site. He gives helpful bibliographical information for each entry.

FINEGAN (2957m) often cites Josephus as a source.

### 25.1: Josephus and Archaeology: Asophon

- (2958) NELSON GLUECK: Three Israelite Towns in the Jordan Valley: Zarethan, Succoth, Zaphon. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 90, 1943, pp. 2–23.
- (2959) FLOYD V. FILSON: Where Was Asophon? In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 91, 1943, pp. 27–28.
- (2960) NELSON GLUECK: On the Site of Asophon in the Jordan Valley. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 92, 1943, pp. 26–27.

GLUECK (2958) says that Asophon of the time of Alexander Jannaeus (Ant. 13. 338) is probably to be identified with Zaphon and locates it at Tel-el-Qôš.

FILSON (2959) objects that Tel-el-Qôš was not occupied in the time of Alexander Jannaeus.

GLUECK (2960) suggests that perhaps Khirbet Beweib is to be identified with Asophon, but himself admits that it does not have the strongly fortified position that one would expect in a place chosen by Jannaeus as his camp.

### 25.2: Caesarea

- (2961) FRANK MORRISON (pseudonym for ALBERT H. ROSS): *And Pilate Said – A New Study of the Roman Procurator*. New York 1940.
- (2962) JOSEF GORBACH: Caesarea Palästina. Die versunkene Stadt und heilige Stätte am Meer. In: *Das Heilige Land in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart* 4, Köln 1949, pp. 45–80.
- (2963) ADOLF REIFENBERG: Caesarea: A Study in the Decline of a Town. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 1, 1950–51, pp. 20–32.
- (2964) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Notes and News: Caesarea. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 6, 1956, pp. 260–261.
- (2965) LEO KADMAN: *The Coins of Caesarea Maritima (= Corpus Nummorum Palaestiniensium, vol. 2)*. Jerusalem 1957.
- (2966) P. RUSSELL DIPLOCK: The Date of Askalon's Sculptured Panels and an Identification of the Caesarea Statues. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 103, 1971, pp. 13–16.
- (2967) LEE I. A. LEVINE: *A History of Caesarea under Roman Rule*. Diss., 2 vols., Columbia University, New York 1970.
- (2967a) LEE I. LEVINE: The Jewish-Greek Conflict in First Century Caesarea. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, 1974, pp. 381–397.
- (2968) LEE I. LEVINE: *Caesarea under Roman Rule (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 7)*. Leiden 1975.

- (2968a) LEE I. LEVINE: A propos de la fondation de la Tour de Straton. In: *Revue Biblique* 80, 1973, pp. 75–81.
- (2968b) AVRAHAM NEGEV: *Caesarea*. Tel-Aviv 1967.
- (2968c) P. RUSSELL DIPLOCK: Further Comment on 'an Identification of the Caesarea Statues'. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 105, 1973, pp. 165–166.
- (2968d) CHARLES T. FRITSCH, ed.: *The Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima*, vol. 1: *Studies in the History of Caesarea Maritima* (*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Supplemental Studies, no. 19). Missoula, Montana 1975.
- (2968e) GIDEON FOERSTER: *The Early History of Caesarea*. In: CHARLES T. FRITSCH, ed., *The Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima*, vol. 1: *Studies in the History of Caesarea Maritima* (*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Supplemental Studies, no. 19). Missoula, Montana 1975. Pp. 9–22.
- (2968f) IRVING M. LEVEY: *Caesarea and the Jews*. In: CHARLES T. FRITSCH, ed., *The Joint Expedition to Caesarea Maritima*, vol. 1: *Studies in the History of Caesarea Maritima* (*Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Supplemental Studies, no. 19). Missoula, Montana 1975. Pp. 43–78.
- (2968g) JOSEPH RINGEL: *Césarée de Palestine. Étude historique et archéologique*. Diss. Sorbonne, Paris 1964. Publ.: Paris and Strasbourg 1975.
- (2968h) AVRAHAM NEGEV: *Caesarea Maritima*. In: RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton 1976. P. 182.
- (2968i) ARYEH KASHER: *The Isopoliteia Question in Caesarea Maritima*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 68, 1977–78, pp. 16–27.
- (2968j) BARUCH LIFSHITZ: *Césarée de Palestine, son histoire et ses institutions*. In: WOLFGANG HAASE und HILDEGARD TEMPORINI edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2. 8, 1977, pp. 490–518.
- (2968k) LEE I. LEVINE: *Roman Caesarea: An Archaeological-Topographical Study* (Qedem: Monographs of the Institute of Archaeology, The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 2). Jerusalem 1975.
- (2968l) LEE I. LEVINE and EHUD NETZER: *New Light on Caesarea* (in Hebrew). In: *Qadmoniot* 11, 1978, pp. 70–75.

ROSS (2961), in a popular account, says that Josephus' description of Caesarea's harbor is accurate, despite most scholars who say that he is exaggerating.

GORBACH (2962) uses Josephus uncritically and is oblivious to the finds of archaeology in his history of Caesarea, especially its founding by Herod, its statues in New Testament times, and its role in the Jewish war against the Romans (pp. 50–58).

REIFENBERG (2963) presents a general survey of the harbor, walls, and public buildings of Caesarea, with close co-ordination of Josephus and archaeology.

AVI-YONAH (2964) notes that excavations reveal the foundations of a large public building of the Herodian period.

KADMAN (2965), pp. 16–22, summarizes the historical background of Caesarea, presents an excellent map of the Herodian town, and gives a good summary of Herod's building program there. He credits Josephus with a detailed knowledge of the city, noting that he was born only fifty years after its founding, that he visited it many times, and that he lived in it for months. In particular, he notes that underwater explorers confirmed in 1956 Josephus'

statement (Ant. 15. 334) that the harbor was large enough so that entire fleets could anchor near its shore.

DIPLOCK (2966), on the basis of the similarity to a portrait of Augustus in Vienna and its coupling with Rome, argues that two colossal statues found at Caesarea are those of Caesar and of Rome described by Josephus (War 1. 414 and Ant. 15. 339); if so, they are the sole surviving sculptures that can be dated to the period of Herod.

LEVINE (2967) (2968) presents a comprehensive study integrating a critical use of Josephus, rabbinic materials, Samaritan sources, archaeological remains, and coins. He notes the differing characterizations of Caesarea in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities', which, he says, also reflect the various viewpoints of Josephus' sources, the 'War' offering the official Herodian view and the 'Antiquities' being less dependent on Nicolaus and viewing Caesarea as a non-Jewish city. In particular, he focusses (2967a) on the discrepancies between the 'War' and the 'Antiquities' in their accounts of the strife between Jews and non-Jews in Caesarea (War 2. 266–270, Ant. 20. 173–178) in 59–60. He notes that, as in Alexandria, the dispute was over *ισοπολιτεία*; but in Caesarea the Jews went further in actually claiming precedence and suggests that the Zealots had influenced the Caesarean Jews. We may comment that there is no evidence of Zealot activity in Caesarea, a fact that Josephus, whose hatred for the Zealots knew no bounds, was hardly likely to omit.

LEVINE (2968a), presenting part of his 'History of Caesarea under Roman Rule', is critical of Josephus' statement on the existence of a port between Dora and Jaffa in this period. The suggestion of Josephus that Caesarea was founded to add a supplementary stop on the commercial route between Egypt and Phoenicia does not accord with the dimensions of the port facility nor with the key role which it played in Mediterranean commerce. Perhaps, he suggests, Josephus' source envisaged the commercial role of the Tower of Strato and not the Caesarea of Herod. Hence the most probable epoch for the founding of the Tower of Strato is that of Strato I, King of Sidon.

NEGEV (2968b) has a good, brief survey of the history of Caesarea.

DIPLOCK (2968c) cites Josephus (Ant. 15. 339, War 1. 414) that in the temple of Augustus there was a colossal statue of Caesar no smaller than that of Zeus at Olympia, which it was designed to resemble. The statues found at Caesarea are too small to qualify as the colossal pair (the other being a statue of Rome) from the temple of Augustus.

FRITSCH (2968d) has a series of essays that were originally contributed for a symposium planned by FRITSCH in the early 1960's. The authors are unaware of LEVINE's dissertation on the subject.

FOERSTER (2968e) uncritically measures Josephus and the classical authors against archaeological data in recounting the known information concerning Strato's Tower (Caesarea). He notes that from Josephus we learn more about the plan and construction, the architecture, and statuary of Caesarea Maritima than we know of any other city in the ancient world; we may contend, however, that he tells us more about Jerusalem. He notes that Caesarea was the most important city in Palestine for six hundred years, from the first to the seventh

century C.E. He notes that Tacitus recognized its importance in calling it *Iudaeae caput*; but we may comment that this may be mere recognition of the fact that Caesarea became the provincial capital in 6 C.E.

LEVY (1968f), in an analytical and interpretive synopsis, cites support in rabbinic tradition for Josephus' view that the Jewish settlement at Caesarea was not in existence during the pre-Herodian period. He cites the reasons for the strife between Jews and non-Jews in Caesarea. He summarizes uncritically the events at Caesarea which provoked revolution against Rome.

RINGEL (1968g) says that so far as Caesarea is concerned, the archaeological findings show that the criticism of Josephus is too severe. Assembling the literary, epigraphic, and numismatic sources, he surveys the history of Caesarea from its origin to the Arab conquest. He is particularly concerned with demography, social and economic life, the water supply, and defense. He, however, omits incidents which are generally known if he cannot clarify them; hence he omits the role of Caesarea in the Jewish War or in connection with the procurators before it.

NEGEV (1968h) has a brief summary of the principal finds at Caesarea, often using Josephus as a guide.

KASHER (1968i) contests the interpretation of LEVINE (1967a), who, basing himself on Antiquities 20. 173, 183, had argued that the term *ισοπολιτεία* refers to a legal situation according to which, in a number of πόλεις throughout the Diaspora, Jews possessed civic rights equal to those of their neighbors. The equality sought, according to KASHER, was rather that between the separate and coexisting political bodies, the Greek *polis* and the Jewish *politeuma*. Full citizenship, he contends, involved religious apostasy; but we may reply that the average Jew may well have been undisturbed by such an anomaly and may well have rationalized it as he did compromises with Jewish law with regard to charging interest and with regard to idolatry as seen in papyri in Egypt. An examination of Josephus' evidence on the Jewish-Greek conflict in Caesarea (War 2. 266–270, 280–292; Ant. 20. 173–187, 182–184) shows that despite the theoretical equality between the two communities there, in practice the Greeks enjoyed precedence, though the Jews aimed to win precedence because of their greater number and wealth. Yet, the result of this was the very opposite of what the Jews had intended. The Greeks thus had a number of political advantages, the most outstanding of which was expressed significantly in their identification with the *polis*. The Jews, KASHER concludes, were fighting for the right of self-organization on an equal footing with the Greek inhabitants. In contrast, in Alexandria, a peaceful co-existence was the goal of the Jews, who were more moderate.

LIFSHTIZ (1968j), who relies principally upon the evidence of epigraphy, gives a history of the exploration of the site and of the region, a short history of Caesarea, a brief discussion of the religious cults and of the political organization, a description of the chief buildings, and a discussion of the Jewish community and of the languages of the inscriptions.

LEVINE (1968k) notes that systematic archaeological exploration of Caesarea has never been undertaken. The city undoubtedly contained impressive build-

ings, many of which lie buried. In particular, Herod utilized advanced and complex techniques, imported from Italy, in his building program at Caesarea. These techniques provide the first substantial evidence of the architectural Romanization of the East under the Principate.

LEVINE and NETZER (29681) describe mosaics found at Caesarea which are similar to those of the Herodian period, and they suggest that they were part of a villa or palace constructed there by Herod, according to Josephus (Ant. 15. 331).

### 25.3: Callirrhoe

(2969) HERBERT DONNER: Kallirrhöe: Das Sanatorium Herodes' des Großen. In: Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins 79, 1963, pp. 59–89.

(2970) AUGUST STROBEL: Zur Ortslage von Kallirrhöe. In: Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins 82, 1966, pp. 149–162.

(2970a) AUGUST STROBEL: Auf der Suche nach Machärus und Kallirrhoe. Selbstzeugnisse und Dokumente zu einem geographischen Problem des 19. Jahrhunderts. In: Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins 93, 1977, pp. 247–267.

DONNER (2969) says that Callirrhoe (War 1. 656–658) is not 'Ēn ez-zāra or lš' (Genesis 10. 19), in view of Josephus, the rabbinic sources, the map of Madeba, and the archaeological finds.

STROBEL (2970) returns, however, to the identification as Ez-zāra.

STROBEL (2970a) discusses thirty-two attempts in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to determine the exact locations of Machaerus and Callirrhoe.

### 25.4: Caphareccho

(2971) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Missing Fortress of Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: Erez-Israel, vol. 1, dedicated to Moshe Schwabe (Ha-ḥevrah ha-ivrit leḥakirat Erez-Yisrael). Jerusalem 1951. Pp. 102–103.

(2972) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Missing Fortress of Flavius Josephus. In: Israel Exploration Journal 3, 1953, pp. 94–98 (somewhat expanded version of the preceding entry).

(2973) MENASHE HAR-EL: The Zealots' Fortresses in Galilee. In: Israel Exploration Journal 22, 1972, pp. 123–130.

(2974) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Notes on the Fortresses of Josephus in Galilee. In: Israel Exploration Journal 24, 1974, pp. 108–116.

AVI-YONAH (2971)(1972), commenting on the discrepancy between War 2. 573–574 and Life 187–188, identifies the missing fortress, Caphareccho, or Capharath, in Galilee as Ephrath (Apharata) at Khirbet et-Taiybeh, which commands a wide view toward the west, whence the enemy was expected.

HAR-EL (2973) objects, saying that the fortress is west of the watershed, near which all the Zealots' fortresses were built, that it is in a region of vulnerable low hills, and that it has no visual communication with Acre or Mount Assamon. HAR-EL suggests that Apharata was Kokhav ha-Yarden east of et-Taiybeh, which was in the best position to serve as an observation post.

BAR-KOCHVA (1974) says that HAR-EL's identification of Caphareccho with Kokhav ha-Yarden is unsupportable from palaeographical, textual, political, military, ethnographic, and topographical points of view. Josephus' hands in Galilee, he suggests, were tied when it came to planning his fortresses. Some settlements may have been occupied by his Jewish opponents, while others may have submitted to the Romans.

### 25.5: Gaba

- (1975) ALBRECHT ALT: Die Reiterstadt Gaba. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 62, 1939, pp. 3–21.  
 (1976) BENJAMIN MAISLER: Beth She'arim, Gaba, and Harosheth of the Peoples. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 24, 1952–53, pp. 75–84.

ALT (1975), discussing the reference in Josephus, favors the location of Gaba of the Cavalry (War 3. 36, Ant. 15. 294) in the vicinity of Kīre.

MAISLER (1976), on the basis of archaeological finds, identifies Gaba with el-Hārītīyye.

### 25.6: Gerasa

- (1977) CARL H. KRAELING, ed.: *Gerasa: City of the Decapolis*. New Haven 1938.  
 (1978) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Samaria and 'Marissa' of Antiquities XIII, 275 (in Hebrew). In: *Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society* 16, 1951, pp. 29–31.  
 (1979) JEAN STARCKY: Nouvelle épitaphe nabatéenne donnant le nom sémitique de Pétra. In: *Revue Biblique* 72, 1965, pp. 95–97.  
 (1979a) GÖTZ SCHMITT: Topographische Probleme bei Josephus. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 91, 1975, pp. 50–68.  
 (1979b) WILLIAM L. MACDONALD: Gerasa. In: RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton 1976. Pp. 348–349.

KRAELING (1977), p. 45, concludes that what we know of the development of Gerasa in the Decapolis during the latter half of the first century and its participation in the life of the Roman Empire provides the necessary corrective for Josephus' statements about its fate during the Jewish war against Rome. KRAELING is especially critical of Josephus' statements (War 2. 458, 2. 478–480, 4. 487–488) on the sack of the city by bands of Jews and on the punitive expedition of Lucius Annius.

AVI-YONAH (1978) suggests correcting Μαρισηνούς (Ant. 13. 275), since it is difficult to see how the Samaritans could have come to Marisa, a city in Idumaea, to Γερσσηνούς, i.e., the inhabitants of the village of Gerasa (cf. War 4. 487).

STARCKY (1979) comments on a Nabataean inscription of Petra which also mentions Gerasa, the first mention in a Semitic text.

SCHMITT (1979a) discusses geographical and historical problems connected with Josephus' references to Gerasa (War 1. 104; cf. Ant. 13. 393, where for Essa we should read Gerasa). He suggests that perhaps the site is Hippos.

MACDONALD (2979b) has a fairly extensive summary of the principal archaeological finds of Gerasa. He often uses Josephus as a guide but without commenting on his reliability.

## 25.7: Herodium

- (2980) VIRGILIO CORBO: Gebal Fureidis: Risultati della prima campagna di scavi all'Herodion. In: *La Terra Santa* 8–10, Aug.–Sept.–Oct. 1962, pp. 231–235.
- (2981) VIRGILIO CORBO: L'Herodion di Giabal Fureidis: Relazione preliminare della due prime campagne di scavo 1962–1963. In: *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 13, 1962–63, pp. 219–277.
- (2981a) VIRGILIO CORBO: L'Herodion di Giabal Fureidis: Relazione preliminare della terza e quarta campagna di scavi archeologici (1. IX–17. X 1964; 25. VII 1966–16. I 1967). In: *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 17, 1966–67, pp. 65–121.
- (2981b) VIRGILIO CORBO: L'Herodion di Giabal Fureidis. In: JOSEPH AVIRAM, ed., *Jerusalem through the Ages (The Twenty-fifth Archaeological Convention, Oct. 1967)*. Jerusalem 1968. Pp. 42–47. Trans. into French: Gébel Fureidis (Herodium). In: *Revue Biblique* 75, 1968, pp. 424–428.
- (2982) E. JERRY VARDAMAN: The History of Herodium. In: E. JERRY VARDAMAN and JAMES L. GARRETT, edd., *The Teacher's Yoke: Studies in Memory of Henry Trantham*. Waco, Texas 1964. Pp. 58–81.
- (2983) FRITZ BERGER: Herodes-Renaissance. In: *Israel Forum* 12, 1970, pp. 30–32.
- (2984) G. FOERSTER: Hérodium. In: *Revue Biblique* 77, 1970, pp. 400–401.
- (2985) EHUD NETZER: Herodium. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 22, 1972, pp. 247–249. Trans. into French: Herodium. In: *Revue Biblique* 80, 1973, pp. 419–421.
- (2986) A. SEGAL: Herodium. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 23, 1973, pp. 27–29.
- (2986a) W(ERNER) BAIER: Die Königsburg Herodeion bei Bethlehem. In: *Das Heilige Land* 100. 2, December 1968, pp. 34–47.
- (2986b) E. JERRY VARDAMAN: Herodium: A Brief Assessment of Recent Suggestions. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 25, 1975, pp. 45–46.
- (2986c) DAVID AMIT: *Fortresses of the Desert in the Days of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). 2nd ed., Kefar Etzion 1976.
- (2986d) WILLIAM L. MACDONALD: Herodium. In RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton 1976. P. 390.

CORBO (2980) presents a brief report of the excavations of Herodium, which he says confirm the description in Josephus (War 1. 419–421).

CORBO (2981) gives an extensive summary of the first and second sessions of excavations at Herodium, particularly of the baths. He describes the site of Herodium (modern Jebel Fureidis) as discussed in Josephus (War 1. 419–421; Ant. 15. 323–325) and, in particular, the excavations of the Herodian buildings found there in the first and second seasons of the excavations.

CORBO (2981a) describes the finds of the third and fourth seasons of excavations, which, he asserts, confirm the essential reliability of Josephus' report, though, he admits, we are not able to subscribe to all of Josephus' assertions about the profusion of marble.

CORBO (2981b) briefly summarizes the archaeological finds at Herodium.

VARDAMAN (2982) summarizes the history of Herodium from its foundation in 24/23 B.C.E. throughout antiquity. In an appendix he cites references to



it in Josephus, the Talmud, and Muraba'at near the Dead Sea, and discusses these in the light of excavations there in 1962. Josephus, as he notes, implies that the city was captured rather quickly without a totally destructive siege; and archaeology, indeed, shows that it was not completely destroyed until after the period of the Bar Kochba rebellion in 132–135.

BERGER (1983) reports on the history of Herodium and on the buildings now accessible after the conclusion of excavations there.

FOERSTER (1984) describes the excavations, noting that there are four cisterns, similar to those at Masada, and corresponding in part to Josephus' description.

NETZER (1985), describing the excavations, remarks that all the structures found thus far are associated with one period of building, that of Herod, and that the 'Upper Herodium', a large architectural project in itself, is only part of a large complex. He notes that the excavations clarify numerous problems posed by Josephus (see War 1. 419–421, Ant. 15. 323–325).

SEGAL (1986), on the basis of Josephus, establishes that Herodium was built between 24–22 and 15 B.C.E. and convincingly argues that its model was the mausoleum of Augustus in Rome of 28 B.C.E. This is borne out by the extraordinary conical shape resembling Augustus' Mausoleum, and by the fact that Herod was buried there by his own order, this being the only one of Herod's building projects bearing his name.

BAIER (1986a) discusses the excavations in the light of the relevant reports in Josephus (War 1. 419–421, 671–673; Ant. 15. 323–325).

VARDAMAN (1986b) disagrees with SEGAL (1986) as to the date of the construction of Herodium. He notes that Josephus (Ant. 15. 299–316) tells us that in 25–24 B.C.E. there was a severe drought in Judea which caused famine and pestilence. It would seem logical that Herod undertook ambitious building projects as relief programs at that time, just as drought furnished a reason for rebuilding the Temple. SEGAL assumes that the Herodium near Bethlehem was the only Herodium and that Josephus' reference to another Herodium on the Arabian frontier is erroneous; but VARDAMAN suggests that Josephus' Herodium near Arabia may have been a fortress built in Herod's fortieth year, about 33 B.C.E.

AMIT (1986c), pp. 36–42, contains unannotated selections from the sources, notably Josephus, concerning Herodium.

MACDONALD (1986d) comments that the recent Italian excavations within the walls tend to bear out Josephus' declarations of the magnificence of Herodium.

## 25.8: Jericho

(1987) JAMES L. KELSO: The First Campaign of Excavation in New Testament Jericho. In: Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 120, 1950, pp. 11–22.

(1988) LUCETTA MOWRY: Settlements in the Jericho Valley during the Roman Period (63 B.C.–A.D. 134). In: Biblical Archaeologist 15, 1952, pp. 26–42.

- (2988a) EHUD NETZER: The Hasmonean and Herodian Winter Palaces at Jericho. In: Israel Exploration Journal 25, 1975, pp. 89–100.
- (2988b) EHUD NETZER: The Winter Palaces of the Judean Kings at Jericho at the End of the Second Temple Period. In: Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 228, 1977, pp. 1–13.
- (2988c) DAVID AMIT: Fortresses of the Desert in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). 2nd ed., Kefar Etzion 1976.

KELSO (1987), noting that Josephus (Ant. 17. 340) states that Archelaus rebuilt the royal palace in Jericho in splendid fashion, suggests that it was Archelaus rather than Herod who constructed the recently excavated building, since it is *opus reticulum* (small pyramidal stones giving a design of a net), very different from Herod's method of building.

MOWRY (1988) presents a general survey of the geography and climate of the towns of the area, the Herodian buildings, the history of the city, and especially the activities of the royal family and of the upper class of Jericho society. She concludes that the archaeological finds confirm Josephus.

NETZER (1988a) says that the finds of pottery and coins in Jericho indicate that the winter palace complex was used by the last Hasmonean kings as well as by Herod. The drowning of the young Aristobulus III (Ant. 15. 50–56) while feasting with Alexandra may well have taken place in the newly excavated pool. He concludes that the reference in War 1. 407 to a former palace in Jericho is to be identified with the Hasmonean palace.

NETZER (1988b) describes what he terms the “winter palace center” of the Judean kings from the last of the Hasmoneans to Herod and his descendants. He also asserts that Josephus' dramatic account (Ant. 15. 50–56) of the drowning at Jericho of the Hasmonean Aristobulus III, brother of Herod's wife Mariamne, tallies faithfully with the palace unearthed north of Wadi Qelt. Both the description of the floor and the size of the beams of the enlarged palace are reminiscent of Herod's palace in Jerusalem (War 1. 402, 5. 176–183; Ant. 15. 318); in addition, the names of the halls in the Jerusalem palace provide still another parallel.

AMIT (1988c) contains unannotated selections from the sources, notably Josephus, concerning the Jericho area.

## 25.9: Jerusalem: General

- (2989) FÉLIX MARIE ABEL: Topographie du siège de Jérusalem en 70. In: Revue Biblique 56, 1949, pp. 238–258.
- (2990) JAN J. SIMONS: Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories (= Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dicata, 1). Leiden 1952.
- (2991) LOUIS-HUGUES VINCENT and M. A. (MARIE JOSEPH) STÈVE: Jérusalem de l'Ancient Testament. 2 vols. Paris 1954–56.
- (2992) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, ed.: Jerusalem. Its Natural Conditions, History and Development from the Origins to the present Day (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Jerusalem 1956.
- (2993) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Zion, the Perfection of Beauty. In: Ariel 18, Spring 1967, pp. 25–44.
- (2994) KATHLEEN M. KENYON: Jerusalem: Excavating 3000 Years of History. London 1967.

Trans. into German by JOACHIM REHORK: Jerusalem. Die Heilige Stadt von David bis zu den Kreuzzügen. Ausgrabungen 1961–1967. Bergisch-Gladbach 1968.

- (2995) NORMAN KOTKER: The Earthly Jerusalem. New York 1969.
- (2996) STANISLAO LOFFREDA: Recenti scoperte archeologiche à Gerusalemme. La Gerusalemme del Nuovo Testamento. In: Rivista Biblica 17, 1969, pp. 175–192.
- (2997) PIERRE PRIGENT: La fin de Jérusalem. Neuchâtel 1969.
- (2998) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: La Jérusalem du temps d'Hérode. In: Bible et Terre Sainte 117, 1970, pp. 6–13.
- (2999) R. GRAFMAN: Herod's Foot and Robinson's Arch. In: Israel Exploration Journal 20, 1970, pp. 60–66.
- (3000) GEORGES LUGANS: Flavius Josèphe, témoin et historien. In: La Terre Sainte 6–7, 1970, pp. 175–184.
- (3001) BENJAMIN MAZAR: The Temple Mount of Jerusalem. In: Illustrated London News 261, no. 6894, Jan. 1973, p. 55–58; no. 6895, Feb. 1973, pp. 54–55.
- (3001a) WERNER MÜLLER: Die heilige Stadt. Roma quadrata, himmlisches Jerusalem und die Mythe vom Weltnabel. Stuttgart 1961.
- (3001b) R. PEARCE S. HUBBARD: The Topography of Ancient Jerusalem. In: Palestine Exploration Quarterly 98, 1966, pp. 130–154.
- (3001c) NAHMAN AVIGAD: The Architecture of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period (in Hebrew). In: Qadmoniot 1, 1968, pp. 28–36. Trans. and abridged by R. GRAFMAN in: YIGAEI YADIN, ed., Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974. Jerusalem (The Israel Exploration Society) 1975. Pp. 14–20.
- (3001d) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period (in Hebrew). In: Qadmoniot 1, 1968, pp. 19–27. Trans. and abridged by R. GRAFMAN in: YIGAEI YADIN, ed., Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974. Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 9–13.
- (3001e) TEDDY KOLLEK and MOSHE PEARLMAN: Jerusalem: A History of Forty Centuries. New York 1968. Trans. into Hebrew as: Jerusalem: 4000 Years of History of the Eternal City. Tel-Aviv 1969.
- (3001f) BENJAMIN MAZAR: Archaeological Excavations near the Temple Mount: Second Sketch: Seasons 1969–1970 (in Hebrew). In Erez-Israel 10, 1971, pp. 1–33. Trans. into English: The Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem near the Temple Mount: Preliminary Report of the Second and Third Seasons 1969–1970. Jerusalem, The Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University, 1971, pp. 1–36.
- (3001g) BENJAMIN MAZAR: The Excavations South and West of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem: The Herodian Period. In: Biblical Archaeologist 33, 1970, pp. 47–60. Also in: Ariel 12, 1971, pp. 11–20.
- (3001h) KATHLEEN M. KENYON: Digging up Jerusalem. London 1974.
- (3001i) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Excavations in Jerusalem – Review and Evaluation. In: YIGAEI YADIN, ed., Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974. Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 21–24.
- (3001j) KATHLEEN M. KENYON: Aelia Capitolina / Jerusalem. In: RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites. Princeton 1976. Pp. 12–13.
- (3001k) BARUCH LIFSHITZ: Jérusalem sous la domination romaine. Histoire de la ville depuis la conquête de Pompée jusqu'à Constantin (63 a.C.–325 p.C.). In: WOLFGANG HAASE and HILDEGARD TEMPORINI, edd., Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt 2.8, 1977, pp. 444–489.
- (3001l) MEIR BEN-DOV: Herodian Jerusalem Revisited. In: Christian News from Israel 26, 1978, pp. 138–142.
- (3001m) JOHN D. WILKINSON: Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It: Archaeology as Evidence. London and New York 1978.
- (3001n) DAVID H. K. AMIRAN, ARIE SHACHAR, and ISRAEL KIMHI, edd.: Atlas of Jerusalem. Jerusalem 1973.

(3001o) DAVID H. K. AMIRAN, ARIE SHACHAR, and ISRAEL KIMHI, edd.: *Urban Geography of Jerusalem: A Companion Volume to the Atlas of Jerusalem*. Jerusalem 1973.

There is general agreement that, despite a century of digging, the single most important site in the land of Israel which still remains to be fully excavated and which is likely to yield the most spectacular results is Jerusalem. Inasmuch as Josephus was a native of the city and describes it at some length, he is the chief guide for the archaeologists, though he is often disproven as to details.

ABEL (1989) follows Josephus as a guide in discussing the findings of archaeology with regard to the topography of Jerusalem, and, in particular, the nature and worth of its defenses.

SIMONS (1990), based on a very careful, first-hand observation of the remains, comments (pp. 35–59) on Josephus' description of Jerusalem (War 5. 136–141), noting, in particular, Josephus' error in mentioning three hills in the Lower City.

VINCENT and STÈVE (1991) present a thorough survey in which they often cite Josephus in describing the archaeology of the city (volume 1) and of the Temple (volume 2).

AVI-YONAH (1992), pp. 221–418, has edited a series of authoritative essays, with lavish illustrations, aimed at the intelligent layman, on the Jerusalem of the period of the Second Temple: history, by AVIGDOR TCHERIKOVER, pp. 221–251; the last siege and destruction of Jerusalem, by ABRAHAM SCHALIT, pp. 252–263; religious and cultural life, by JOSEPH KLAUSNER, pp. 264–304; archaeology and topography, by MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, pp. 305–319; the cemetery, by NAHMAN AVIGAD, pp. 320–348; inscriptions in Hebrew and Aramaic, by YEHEZKEL KUTCHER, pp. 349–357; inscriptions in Greek, by MOSHE SCHWABE, pp. 358–368; the worship of G-d, by SHMUEL SAFRAI, pp. 369–391; and the Second Temple, by MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, pp. 392–418.

AVI-YONAH (1993) describes, with profuse illustrations, a 1:50 model, now at the Holyland Hotel in Jerusalem, which he supervised, of Jerusalem just before the destruction of the Second Temple. For the description of the Temple AVI-YONAH prefers the statements in the Talmud, but for all other topographical questions with regard to the city he regards Josephus as a reliable informant. He notes that occasionally Josephus is directly confirmed by archaeological finds: thus the measurements of the abandoned column in the Russian compound in Jerusalem correspond to those given by Josephus for the columns of the Temple portico and the royal basilica.

KENYON (1994), in a popular, lavishly illustrated book, rewrites the history of Jerusalem, basing herself primarily on her own and others' excavations. She is generally not critical of Josephus in describing Herodian and New Testament Jerusalem (pp. 138–154) and the Jerusalem of Agrippa I and the Roman destruction (pp. 155–186). She concludes that Josephus wrote with accurate knowledge of the Roman campaigns and that the excavations, in particular, provide striking evidence of Titus' destruction of Jerusalem.

KOTKER (1995) has a popular history which uses Josephus uncritically.

LOFFREDA (1996) presents a brief survey of the latest archaeological findings in Jerusalem, especially the three walls of the Herodian city in 70, the Temple, and the Antonia. He confirms that Jerusalem of New Testament times is still a buried city and that any diggings will utilize the detailed description of Josephus as a guide.

PRIGENT (1997), in a rather popular work, concludes that the archaeological discoveries confirm the account of Josephus.

AVI-YONAH (1998), in a popular, well-illustrated sketch, correlates Josephus' reports on Herod's buildings with the archaeological remains.

GRAFMAN (1999), relating *Antiquities* 15. 410–415 to the extant remains, calculates the exact measure of the ποῦς referred to by Josephus as 31 centimeters and not the Roman foot of 29.6 centimeters. This turns out to be, not surprisingly, the more or less standard Greek foot of the period.

LUGANS (2000), after a brief sketch of Josephus, presents a number of selections from his works which pertain to Jerusalem.

MAZAR (2001), summarizing the archaeological excavations at the site of the Temple in Jerusalem since 1968, concludes that they help us to understand the description of the Temple in *Antiquities* 15. 410. The inscription "To the place of trumpeting", which has been found, is explained by War 4. 586 as a reference to the place where priests blew the trumpet to usher in the Sabbath. He notes the discovery of large quantities of coins and fragments of pottery, which are particularly numerous for the Herodian period. [See *infra*, p. 962.]

MÜLLER (2001a), p. 53, notes that, according to Josephus (War 3. 52), Jerusalem lies in the middle of Judea and is called the navel of the land.

HUBBARD (2001b) concludes that Josephus did not himself measure the buildings which he described but quoted from ancient records available to him; hence his measure of the cubit is not accurate. As to Josephus' description of the topography of Jerusalem, he was mistaken, since he was overly eager to exaggerate Agrippa's achievement. But Josephus' description of the promontory now occupied by the Holy Sepulchre is accurate in all respects.

AVIGAD (2001c) summarizes the principal excavations, especially of the tombs, in the light of Josephus, and notes that the architecture of Jerusalem was not an isolated style but rather was derived from the general architecture of the period. He concludes that it is very probable that this is highly indicative of the style and form of building in Jerusalem in this period in general, though essentially no true building remains have survived to confirm this.

AVI-YONAH (2001d) has a popular historical survey, co-ordinating the literary sources with archaeological finds.

PEARLMAN and KOLLEK (2001e) have a lavishly illustrated popular history, with special dependence upon Josephus in their account of the Greek period (332–167 B.C.E., pp. 79–84), the Hasmoneans (167–63 B.C.E., pp. 85–94), Herod the Great (37–4 B.C.E., pp. 95–110), and the Great Revolt (66–70, pp. 125–136).

MAZAR (2001f) describes various fragments of panels, friezes, cornices, capitals, small columns, etc., which, he concludes, had fallen from the Royal Stoa described by Josephus, as having been built by Herod at the southern end of

the Temple court – “a structure more noteworthy than any under the sun” (Ant. 15. 412). He declares that from the excavations we may supplement somewhat the detailed picture of Herod’s royal portico (Ant. 15. 414). The finds corroborate Josephus’ statement (War 5. 222–224) about the gold plate outside the Temple. MAZAR thinks that he has perhaps found the remains of the archives building (War 2. 427, 6. 354–355).

MAZAR (3001g) describes the remains that have been uncovered of a magnificent Herodian wall and street. He confirms Josephus’ statement (Ant. 20. 219–220 and War 5. 36–38) that construction work in the Temple area went on until the time of the procurator Albinus.

KENYON (3001h) presents an interim report for the interested layman. She comments (pp. 205–235) on Herod’s building program according to Josephus and on the archaeological finds, and concludes that it is only reasonable to accept Josephus’ description of the appearance of the Temple.

AVI-YONAH (3001i) has a succinct summary of the principal finds and of their significance and of problems remaining. He comments that excavations since the liberation of Jerusalem by Israel in 1967 have provided more positive data than all the previous years combined.

KENYON (3001j) uses Josephus as a guide to the archaeological finds in Jerusalem.

LIFSHITZ (3001k), in a survey which devotes special attention to the epigraphical evidence, gives particular consideration to the commencement of the Roman domination, to Herod the Great and the Herodian building, to the reconstruction of the Temple, to Jerusalem under Archelaus and the procurators, to the Hellenization of Jerusalem, and to the First Revolt.

BEN-DOV (3001l) notes that extensive excavations of Jerusalem since 1967 reveal that the bridge over the Tyropoeon valley projected by ROBINSON never existed, that instead there was a monumental stairway set against the Western Wall, and that Josephus’ description lends credence to this idea. As to the hippodrome, which Josephus says was south of the Temple Mount, BEN-DOV says that it is hard to believe that the densely populated city would have accommodated so expensive a facility within its walls and that the argument for a site so close to the Temple Mount was probably based on a pejorative view of Herod’s personality. We may reply that it hardly seems likely that Josephus, as a native of Jerusalem, would not have known where such a large facility as the hippodrome was located, and that, in any case, if he had deliberately erred in misplacing it this would have been the source of attacks and ridicule by his many opponents. BEN-DOV notes that AVI-YONAH, in his model of the city now located at the Holyland Hotel in West Jerusalem, used the term ‘Missing Wall’ to designate a rampart that supposedly protected the Upper City’s eastern flank, but that it is nowhere mentioned by Josephus. As to AVI-YONAH’s judgment that the Lower City and the Temple Mount fell to the Romans a full month before the Upper City, such stubborn resistance by the Zealots in the Upper City would have been impossible without very solid defences; and recent finds, indeed, confirm that there was a fortified line, though it was not a wall but a mere barricading of buildings. We may suggest that the reason why the Upper

City held out longer was that the Romans saw no need to deal the *coup de grâce*, and that they allowed the Upper City to hold out, just as they later did with Masada.

WILKINSON (3001m), who constantly cites Josephus, describes Jerusalem in Jesus' time, especially its climate, topography, and archaeology.

AMIRAN, SHACHAR, and KIMHI (3001n) have maps of Jerusalem during early Hasmonean times, during the later Hasmonean period, during the reign of Herod, and at the end of the Second Temple period, which largely reflect information supplied by Josephus.

In a companion volume, AMIRAN, SHACHAR, and KIMHI (3001o), pp. 14–16, have historical descriptions elucidating these maps.

## 25.10: The Walls of Jerusalem

- (3002) CEDRIC N. JOHNS: Recent Excavations at the Citadel, Jerusalem. In: Bericht über den VI. Internationalen Kongreß für Archäologie, Berlin 21–26 Aug. 1939. Berlin 1940. Pp. 483–486.
- (3003) WILLIAM F. ALBRIGHT: New Light on the Walls of Jerusalem in the New Testament Age. In: Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 81, 1941, pp. 6–10.
- (3004) WILLIAM ROSS: The Four North Walls of Jerusalem. In: Palestine Exploration Quarterly 74, 1942, pp. 69–81.
- (3005) JAN J. SIMONS: De drie Muren van Jerusalem. In: Jaarbericht van het Vooraziatisch-Egyptisch Genootschap Ex Oriente Lux 10, 1945–48, pp. 472–479.
- (3006) JAN J. SIMONS: Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories (= Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dicata, 1). Leiden 1952.
- (3007) KATHLEEN M. KENYON: Excavations in Jerusalem 1961. In: Palestine Exploration Quarterly 94, 1962, pp. 72–89.
- (3008) EMMET W. HAMRICK: New Excavations at Suenik's Third Wall. In: Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 183, 1966, pp. 19–26.
- (3009) WILLIAM F. ALBRIGHT: Recent Works on the Topography and Archaeology of Jerusalem. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 22, 1931–32, pp. 409–416.
- (3010) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Third and Second Walls of Jerusalem. In: Israel Exploration Journal 18, 1968, pp. 98–125.
- (3011) RUTH AMIRAN: The First and Second Walls of Jerusalem Reconsidered in the Light of the New Wall. In: Israel Exploration Journal 21, 1971, pp. 166–167.
- (3012) NAHMAN AVIGAD: Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, 1970 (Second Preliminary Report). In: Israel Exploration Journal 20, 1970, pp. 129–140.
- (3013) UTE LUX: Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabung unter der Erlöserkirche im Muristan in der Altstadt von Jerusalem in den Jahren 1970 und 1971. In: Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins 88, 1972, pp. 185–201.
- (3014) AUGUST STROBEL: Die Südmauer Jerusalems zur Zeit Jesu (Jos Bell 5, 142ff.): Neue Grabungsergebnisse kritisch betrachtet. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 344–361.
- (3014a) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period (in Hebrew). In: Qadmoniot 1, 1968, pp. 19–27. Trans. into English and abridged by R. GRAFMAN in: YIGAL YADIN, ed., Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974. Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 9–13.

- (3014b) JOHN D. WILKINSON: *Jerusalem as Jesus Knew It: Archaeology as Evidence*. London and New York 1978.
- (3014c) ERNEST-MARIE LAPERROUSAZ: À propos du 'Premier Mur' et du 'Deuxième Mur' de Jérusalem, ainsi que du rempart de Jérusalem à l'époque de Néhémie. In: *Revue des Études juives* 138, 1979, pp. 1–16.
- (3014d) ERNST VOGT: Das Wachstum des alten Stadtgebietes von Jerusalem. In: *Biblica* 48, 1967, pp. 337–358.
- (3014e) BEN-ZION LURIE: The Walls of Jerusalem at the End of the Second Temple Period (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 10, 1971, pp. 160–168.
- (3014f) HILLEL GEVA: The Western Boundary of Jerusalem at the End of the Monarchy. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 29, 1979, pp. 84–91.
- (3014g) KATHLEEN M. KENYON: *Jerusalem: Excavating 3000 Years of History*. London 1967. Trans. into German by JOACHIM REHORK: *Jerusalem. Die Heilige Stadt von David bis zu den Kreuzzügen. Ausgrabungen 1961–1967*. Bergisch-Gladbach 1968.
- (3014h) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Newly-Found Wall of Jerusalem and Its Topographical Significance. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 21, 1971, pp. 168–169.
- (3014i) KARL JAROŠ: Grabungen unter der Erlöserkirche in Jerusalem. In: J. B. BAUER and J. MARBÖCK, edd., *Memoria Jerusalem: Freundesgabe Franz Sauer zum 70. Geburtstag*. Graz 1977. Pp. 167–183.
- (3014j) KATHLEEN M. KENYON: Excavations in Jerusalem, 1965. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 98, 1966, pp. 73–88.
- (3014k) EMMET W. HAMRICK: Further Notes on the 'Third Wall'. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 192, 1968, pp. 21–25.
- (3014l) SARA BEN-ARIEH and EHUD NETZER: Excavations along the 'Third Wall' of Jerusalem, 1972–1974. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 24, 1974, pp. 97–107.
- (3014m) SARA BEN-ARIEH: The 'Third Wall' of Jerusalem. In: YIGAEEL YADIN, ed., *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974*. Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 60–62.
- (3014n) EMMET W. HAMRICK: The Third Wall of Agrippa I. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 40, 1977, pp. 18–23.

JOHNS (3002) describes the western part of a wall mentioned by Josephus and preserved by the Romans and notes that there is a striking contrast between the old and new work of the wall which bears out Josephus' remarks.

ALBRIGHT (3003) identifies new discoveries among the north walls as belonging to the Third Wall of Agrippa I mentioned by Josephus (War 5. 147–160).

ROSS (3004) follows the noted archaeologist ELIEZER L. SUKENIK in arguing that the third north wall could not have run along the present north wall, since the foundations of the third wall have been laid bare several hundred yards north of it.

SIMONS (3005) repeats briefly the views of the various archaeologists who have worked on this problem.

SIMONS (3006) presents a very thorough, conservative discussion of the Third Wall in which he casts doubt on SUKENIK's theory of its extensive course.

KENYON (3007) concludes that Agrippa I, sometime between 40 and 44, probably enlarged the city to the south by building a wall (cf. War 5. 147–155 and Ant. 19. 326–327), the excavation of which she describes.

HAMRICK (3008) says that the wall described by SUKENIK is not the third wall of Agrippa I described by Josephus (War 5. 147–155 and Ant. 19. 326–327), since the incredibly poor masonry cannot have been the work of the



affluent Agrippa I. He concludes that perhaps the time has come to admit that Josephus' data are so obscure and contradictory that they do not in themselves enable one to identify any line of wall as that begun by Agrippa. ALBRIGHT (3009), p. 411, the leading archaeologist of the land of Israel, has noted how inaccurate Josephus generally is in details and has stated (p. 412) that Josephus sometimes speaks so vaguely about the wall and contradicts himself so sharply in different passages that almost any theory of the origin of the wall can be defended. The numismatic evidence, as ALBRIGHT has noted, provides virtually decisive proof that the wall in question was hastily built during the four years of the First Revolt just before the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.

AVI-YONAH (3010) reiterates that Josephus' accounts (War 2. 219, 5. 151–152, and Ant. 19. 326) of the Third Wall are a hopeless muddle of impossible distances (War 5. 153–157), disparate accounts of identical events, and chaotic use of Greek terminology. The statement in Josephus (War 5. 299) about the “great distance from the city” at the point attacked makes no sense, since the utmost possible distance between the two walls does not exceed 150 meters. He concludes that there are valid reasons for the identification of the wall excavated in 1925–27 and its extension as the Third Wall planned by Agrippa I and completed in 66–67.

AMIRAN (3011) comments on the new wall excavated by AVIGAD (3012). She concludes, in a hypothetical reconstruction, that Josephus' Second Wall is the earliest in the series of walls existing in his time, going back to the eighth century B.C.E., and that the First Wall dates from approximately the second half of the second century B.C.E.

LUX (3013) argues that the newly excavated wall in the German Evangelical Church of the Redeemer cannot be a portion of the Second Wall of Josephus, since already several decades earlier the Third Wall of Agrippa I had been extended northward.

STROBEL (3014) concludes that Josephus presents the incontestable fact that Agrippa began the building of the Third Wall to the north of the city but did not complete it (War 5. 152), and that therefore it is very improbable that he was the builder of the questionable south wall.

AVI-YONAH (3014a) comments particularly on the three walls as mentioned by Josephus and as unearthed by archaeology, especially on the dating of these walls. Above all, he uses Josephus to ascertain the course of the Second Wall. He regards a Herodian date as more probable for its construction than a Has-monean date.

WILKINSON (3014b), pp. 63–65, discussing the walls of Jerusalem, concludes that we are unable to add very much to Josephus' account through archaeological discovery, but that Josephus is wrong (War 5. 146) with regard to the Second Wall.

LAPERROUSAZ (3014c) defends the traditional (but generally abandoned) hypothesis that the rampart of Jerusalem reconstructed by Nehemiah was the rampart attacked and crushed by Nebuchadnezzar. He insists on a pre-exilic dating for the first and second walls and notes that archaeological discoveries have already confirmed the sources with regard to the First Wall.

As to the First Wall, VOGT (3014d) says that Josephus knew the whole wall very well and certainly described it with precision, but that he knew almost nothing about its history. He thought of it as a unity and called it the First Wall. As to the mention (Ant. 15. 140) of “the other part of the city”, this can refer only to the *akra*; Josephus did not name it since the non-Jewish leaders for whom he wrote the work would not have understood how the steps down to the ravine could lead to the *akra*.

LURIE (3014e) concludes that Josephus’ description of the First Wall, which was excavated by BLISS in 1894–1897, is incomplete, since he neglected altogether to deal with the wall of the Upper City, where the last fighting took place a month after the Temple’s destruction.

GEVA (3014f) notes that archaeological finds confirm Josephus in the view that the physical features of the southwestern hill of Jerusalem were taken into consideration by the builders of the Hasmonean First Wall. Recent discoveries in the Jewish Quarter of Jerusalem confirm Josephus’ claim that the First Wall originated in the period of the monarchy. The Hasmonean wall followed its predecessor, more than 400 years old, which was still in good enough condition to be the basis of the new line throughout its length.

As to the Second Wall, KENYON (3014g) concludes that the evidence given by Josephus does not provide us with the details necessary to reconstruct the line of this wall.

AVI-YONAH (3014h) argues that the ingenious suggestion of AMIRAN (3011) concerning the possible survival of the northern continuation of the new wall as the Second Wall of Josephus presents numerous difficulties. In particular, the line is much too short for the wall, with fourteen towers running from the Gennath Gate to the Antonia, as Josephus has it (War 5. 146).

JAROŠ (3014i) notes that according to recent archaeological discoveries, the wall under the Church of the Redeemer is not the Second Wall.

As to the Third Wall, KENYON (3014j) notes that Josephus says that Agrippa built the third and outermost north wall. SUKENIK and MAYER claimed that the wall to the north of the present Old City was this wall. KENYON, however, claims that excavations of a portion of this wall have proved that it was not the north wall of Agrippa, since it faced south, not north. Moreover, a number of coins have been found dating from 54 to 59 C.E., that is, after the time of Agrippa. It is almost certainly associated with Titus, who surrounded the city with siege-works, and with the headquarters of the Tenth Legion.

HAMRICK (3014k) concludes that a strong case can now be made for the SUKENIK–MAYER theory that Agrippa’s Third Wall coincided, at least in part, with the present north wall of the city. Josephus’ enthusiastic praise for the wall’s beauty and perfection is in line with the beauty of the newly excavated wall. On the other hand, the SUKENIK–MAYER wall could be an outwork hastily erected by the Jewish insurgents during the Great Revolt.

BEN-ARIEH and NETZER (3014l) note that according to Josephus the construction of the Third Wall was begun by Agrippa I (War 5. 151–152) and completed during the Great War with the Romans (War 5. 155). As a result of excavations in 1972–1974, the authors conclude that the bedding was indeed built

by Agrippa I because the building which fits the description given by Josephus (War 5. 152–153) is so well planned and is founded on natural rock, a method which does not differ from that used in building many other walls of this period.

BEN-ARIEH (3014m) describes a segment of seventy-five meters of the Third Wall mentioned by Josephus and excavated in 1972. It dates from the first century, as indicated by the rubble.

HAMRICK (3014n) asks how Josephus could be silent about an imposing wall to the north of Jerusalem built more than twenty years after Agrippa's death and excavated by KENYON in 1965. He answers by noting that Josephus failed to refer to an even more impressive wall of Jerusalem, namely the great southern barrier built by Agrippa upon the crest of the Hinnom and Kidron valleys. Josephus, he suggests, did not mention the northern wall because Titus circumvented it and attacked the Third Wall from the west. Josephus' description of the Third Wall (War 5. 147–148) can be interpreted to support the identification with the present north wall of the old city. The northern line was probably planned and built entirely between 66 and 70 by Jewish insurgents after the retreat of Cestius Gallus as a protective barrier for the Third Wall.

## 25.11: The Antonia in Jerusalem

- (3015) LOUIS-HUGUES VINCENT: L'Antonia, palais primitif d'Hérode. In: *Revue Biblique* 61, 1954, pp. 87–107.
- (3016) SEUR MARIE ALINE DE SION: La Forteresse Antonia à Jérusalem et la question du Prétoire. Thesis, Paris 1955 Publ.: Jerusalem 1956.
- (3017) LOUIS-HUGUES VINCENT and M. A. (MARIE JOSEPH) STÈVE: Jérusalem de l'Ancient Testament. 2 vols. Paris 1954–56.
- (3018) CHRISTIAN MAURER: Der Struthionteich und die Burg Antonia. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 80, 1964, pp. 137–149.
- (3019) MARIE ITA OF SION: The Antonia Fortress. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 100, 1968, pp. 139–143.
- (3020) PIERRE BENOIT: L'Antonia d'Hérode le Grand et le forum oriental d'Aelia Capitolina. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 64, 1971, pp. 135–167.
- (3020a) PIERRE BENOIT: The Archaeological Reconstruction of the Antonia Fortress. In: YIGAL YADIN, ed., *Jerusalem Revealed; Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974*. Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 87–89.
- (3020b) ERICH W. COHN: The Appendix of Antonia Rock in Jerusalem. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 111, 1979, pp. 41–52.

VINCENT (3015), commenting on the description of the tower of Antonia in War 5. 238–246 and on archaeological findings, notes that the tower was, for ten years or less, the royal palace of Herod.

MARIE ALINE DE SION (3016) generally follows VINCENT and STÈVE (3017) in her thorough and careful coverage of the history of the Antonia and in her description of its remains. She concludes that Josephus' description conforms with the archaeological discoveries. We may comment, however, that the Antonia could benefit from further study by a scholar who can analyze its military construction and use.

MAURER (3018) disputes the hypothesis of VINCENT and STÈVE on the considerable extent of the Antonia. He states that the cistern which still exists is the Struthion Pool of Josephus (War 5. 466–472), which lay outside the Antonia to the north of the present Temple wall, that War 5. 467 is to be understood (against Vincent) in the middle of the so-called Struthion Pool, and that, in all probability, the Tower of Antonia covered a comparatively small area which was sharply cut off from the surrounding land.

MARIE ITA OF SION (3019), after presenting a brief account of the excavation of the Antonia, discusses the topography of the Antonia and its relationship to Josephus' description (War 5. 4–5). She agrees with AVI-YONAH that if we do not follow Josephus, we would have no other source to guide us, that our opinions would become mere fantasies, and that, in fact, archaeological discoveries to a high degree confirm War 5. 4–5. She agrees that the Antonia actually dominated the Temple.

BENOIT (3020) argues, against VINCENT, that the pavement in the present-day convent of the Sisters of Zion north of the Temple dates not from Herodian but from Hadrianic times and that the Struthion Pool (War 5. 467) covered by the pavement had not yet been covered in 70 during the siege of Jerusalem.

BENOIT (3020a), commenting on the fortress of Antonia (War 5. 238–245), asserts that it stood on the mass of rock where the Omariyah School stands today, that is, south of the spot generally assigned to it in the reconstructions. The mass of rock, measuring 120 by 45 metres, is not too small for such a fortress as described by Josephus. The Antonia fortress, he says, did not include the Struthion Pool, which was still an open reservoir in 70 during the siege (War 5. 467).

COHN (3020b) challenges the widely accepted view that the present southern scarp of Antonia Rock below the Omariyah School should be regarded as the work of Herod. The rocky appendix cannot have been regarded as an asset by the builder of the fortress. Herod's main work consisted of creating a new open-air water reservoir to the north. The subterranean passage under the appendix was built over an extended period. Its existence was crucial during the period described by Josephus that reached its climax with the destruction of the Roman ramp by the forces led by John of Gischala.

## 25.12: Other Sites in Jerusalem (see also 19.16)

- (3021) N. P. CLARKE: Helena's Pyramids. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 70, 1938, pp. 84–104.
- (3022) MAXIMILIAN KON: *The Tombs of the Kings* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1947 (orig., diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem).
- (3023) STEPHAN (sic): *Der 'Frauenturm' des Josephus am Damaskus-Tor in Jerusalem*. In: *Evangelisches Gemeindeblatt für Palästina und Syrien* 14, 1938, p. 6.
- (3024) CEDRIC N. JOHNS: *Excavations at the Citadel, Jerusalem, 1934–9*. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 72, 1940, pp. 36–58.
- (3025) CEDRIC N. JOHNS: *The Citadel, Jerusalem: a Summary of Work since 1934*. In: *Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine* 14, 1950, pp. 121–190.

- (3026) PIERRE BENOIT: Prétoire, Lithostroton et Gabbatha. In: *Revue Biblique* 59, 1952, pp. 531–550. Rpt. in his: *Exégèse et théologie*. Paris 1961. Trans. into German by ERNEST S. REICH: *Exegese und Theologie*. Düsseldorf 1965. Pp. 149–166.
- (3027) LOUIS-HUGUES VINCENT: L'Antonia, palais primitif d'Hérode. In: *Revue Biblique* 61, 1954, pp. 87–107.
- (3028) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Art of the Jews till the Destruction of the Second Temple. In his: *Oriental Art in Roman Palestine* (= Università di Roma, Centro di Studi Semitici, Studi Semitici, 5). Rome 1961. Pp. 13–27.
- (3029) WILLIS A. SHOTWELL: The Problem of the Syrian Akra. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 176, Dec. 1964, pp. 10–19.
- (3030) JAN J. SIMONS: Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories (= *Studia Francisci Scholten memoriae dicata*, 1). Leiden 1952.
- (3031) DAVID USSISHKIN: 'The Rock Called Peristreon'. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 24, 1974, pp. 70–72.
- (3031a) R. J. MCKELVEY: *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford Theological Monographs, 3). Oxford 1969.
- (3031b) BENJAMIN MAZAR: The Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem; Preliminary Report of the First Season, 1968. Jerusalem 1969. Pp. 1–21.
- (3031c) BENJAMIN MAZAR: The Excavations South and West of the Temple Mount in Jerusalem: The Herodian Period. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 33, 1970, pp. 47–60. Also in: *Ariel* 12, 1971, pp. 11–20.
- (3031d) BENJAMIN MAZAR: Archaeological Excavations near the Temple Mount: Second Sketch: Seasons 1969–1970 (in Hebrew). In *Erez-Israel* 10, 1971, pp. 1–33. Trans. into English: The Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem near the Temple Mount: Preliminary Report of the Second and Third Seasons 1969–1970. Jerusalem, The Institute of Archaeology, Hebrew University, 1971, pp. 1–36.
- (3031e) BEN ZION LURIA: The Pool of Israel (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 19, 1973, pp. 123–135.
- (3031f) D. BAHAT and M(AGEN) BROSHI: Excavations in the Armenian Garden. In: YIGAEEL YADIN, ed., *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974*. Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 55–56.
- (3031g) YORAM TSAFRIR: The Location of the Seleucid Akra in Jerusalem. In: YIGAEEL YADIN, ed., *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City 1968–1974*. Jerusalem 1975. Pp. 85–86.
- (3031h) ERNEST-MARIE LAPEROUSAZ: Angle sud-est du 'temple de Salomon' ou vestiges de l'Acra des Séleucides? Un faux problème. In: *Syria* 52, 1975, pp. 241–259.
- (3031i) BEN ZION LURIA: The Antiquities of Jerusalem: *Bor HaGolab*; HaSha'ar HaMa'aravi (The Well of the Diaspora; the Western Gate) (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 13. 4, 1967–68, pp. 3–15.
- (3031j) DAVID ADAN (BAYEWITZ): The 'Fountain of Siloam' and 'Solomon's Pool' in First-Century C.E. Jerusalem. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 29, 1979, pp. 92–100.
- (3031k) BARGIL PIXNER: Noch einmal das Prätorium: Versuch einer neuen Lösung. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 95, 1979, pp. 56–86.
- (3031l) A. VAN SELMS: The Origin of the Name Tyropoeon in Jerusalem. In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 91, 1979, pp. 170–176.

CLARKE (3021) objects to placing Helena's pyramids (Ant. 20. 95) at the Tombs of the Kings, where most archaeologists assign them, because this site is about four and a half furlongs from the Damascus Gate or from Herod's Gate (from which Josephus apparently measured), whereas Josephus in our passage says that the distance is three furlongs. He says that the distance must have been well known; but we may comment that one ought not to quibble over a furlong

and a half when an inscription on a sarcophagus found at the Tomb of the Kings bears the words "Helena the Queen".

KON (3022), after careful, on-the-spot examination of the archaeological evidence, rejects CLARKE's suggestion.

I have not seen STEPHAN (3023).

JOHNS (3024), commenting on the palace or citadel of Herod (War 5. 176–183) and especially on the Herodian towers (War 5. 156–175), concludes that archaeology confirms Josephus' account.

JOHNS (3025) proves, on the basis of Josephus, that the bottom half of the Tower of David is Phasael (Ant. 5. 166–169), which was constructed by Herod.

BENOIT (3026), examining topographical details in particular, argues that the residence of the Roman procurator (the Praetorium of the Gospels) in Jerusalem was, for strategic reasons, in the palace of Herod rather than in the Antonia, as VINCENT (3027) had postulated.

AVI-YONAH (3028), in a general survey, suggests, most plausibly, Mesopotamian influence in the tombs of the Adiabeniens in Jerusalem. He finds similar influence in the ossuaries near the site called 'Dominus Flevit' on the Mount of Olives.

SHOTWELL (3029), considering the location of the Akra fortress left by Antiochus Epiphanes in Jerusalem, denies the assumption of SIMONS (3030) that it is identical with the whole lower city and asserts that it is only the citadel. Josephus' evidence is decisive, since he says (Ant. 12. 252) that the Akra was built in the lower city. In general, SHOTWELL defends the accuracy of Josephus' description of Jerusalem's topography on the basis of archaeological findings.

USSISHKIN (3031) identifies as the Silwan necropolis the reference in Josephus (War 5. 504–505) to a rock called Περιστερεών ("dovecote") since the openings there may well have resembled pigeon-holes. This identification fits both the topography of the area and Josephus' description.

MCKELVEY (3031a) deals with the eschatological associations of the Mount of Olives in the light of Zechariah 14.4 and Josephus (War 2. 261–263 and Ant. 20. 169–172).

MAZAR (3031b) deals especially with the Herodian structures – the walls, gates, masonry, etc. – in Jerusalem.

MAZAR (3031c) describes a wall that has been excavated from the Herodian period. The finds fit in well, he says, with what we know from Josephus, namely that construction work in the area of the Temple Mount went on until the time of Agrippa I.

MAZAR (3031d) concludes that archaeological findings complement Josephus' description of the Royal Stoa (War 5. 222 and Ant. 15. 414). He describes various finds from the Herodian period, especially stone weights, some of them inscribed.

LURIA (3031e) asserts that according to the description of the conquest of Jerusalem by Titus it is reasonable to assume that the name of the pool near the Via Dolorosa was Amygdalon (War 5. 468, 238–247; Ant. 15. 292, 424–425). Herod's aims in building the pool were the defense of the Temple Mount in the north and the defense of the Antonia.

BAHAT and BROSHI (3031f) remark that in building his palace Herod resorted to the same methods which he employed in the construction of the Temple enclosure.

TSAFRIR (3031g) notes that Josephus (Ant. 12. 252) places the Akra in the Lower City on the southeastern hills of Jerusalem. Most scholars place it in the Upper City, regarding it as the more suitable site, overlooking the Temple. But current excavations reveal that there were no major Hellenistic buildings in this area. TSAFRIR concludes that SCHÜRER is right in saying that there were two Akras, one a Ptolemaic fortress north of the Temple and one a Seleucid fortress south of the Temple. This hypothesis will explain how the Akra garrison could slaughter Jews coming from a Temple sacrifice (Ant. 12. 362), how Judah the Maccabee could divert the attention of the Akra guards while he carried out the purification of the Temple (War 1. 39, Ant. 12. 318), and how Nicanor could descend from the Akra to the Temple (Ant. 12. 406).

LAPERROUSAZ (3031h) takes issue with TSAFRIR (3031g), and locates the Akra on the western hill of Jerusalem and cites Antiquities 12. 317–319, 349, 362, 406, 13. 215–217, and War 1. 39 in support of his position.

LURIA (3031i) discusses the locations of the Western Gate (War 6. 324–325, Ant. 15. 410) and suggests that the Mishnah mentions only the Eastern Gate of Jerusalem because it is the oldest.

ADAN (BAYEWITZ) (3031j) uses Josephus in locating a recently discovered pool between the fountain of Siloam and Ophlas. He places the fountain of Siloam itself within the city walls where the present pool of Siloam is located. According to Josephus, the First Wall towered over this pool. Though the supply of water failed before the siege of Titus, once the siege had begun there was plenty of water, presumably overflowing from the fountain, now Canal IV.

PIXNER (3031k) asserts that literary and archaeological evidence opposes the view identifying the Praetorium with the Antonia. A more precise reading of Josephus, as confirmed by the early Christian tradition, indicates that the Praetorium was built by the Hasmoneans and later taken over by Herod. It was located on high ground due west of the royal Temple hall, close by the lower aqueduct.

VAN SELMS (3031l) concludes that the name Τυροποιῶν (τυροποιῶν, “cheese-makers”, War 5. 140) is not an invention of Josephus, since he mentions that the ravine is commonly so called. He expresses doubt that the specialization of trades in Biblical times went so far that there could exist a guild of cheese-makers and theorizes that the name is not a transcription but a translation from a root *ḥrṣ*, which can mean not only “cheese” but also “moat”. Hence the name arose because the valley served as a moat.

### 25.13: Machaerus

(3032) NELSON GLUECK: Explorations in the Land of Ammon. In: Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research 68, 1937, pp. 13–21.

- (3033) MATTHIAS DELCOR: Machéronte. In: *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément 5, Paris 1957, pp. 613–618.
- (3034) AUGUST STROBEL: Machärus – Geschichte und Ende einer Festung im Lichte archäologisch-topographischer Beobachtungen. In: SIEGFRIED WAGNER, ed., *Bibel und Qumran: Festschrift Hans Bardtke*. Berlin 1968. Pp. 198–225.
- (3035) AUGUST STROBEL: Das römische Belagerungswerk um Machärus. Topographische Untersuchungen. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 90, 1974, pp. 128–184.
- (3036) WILLY SCHOTTROFF: Horonaim, Nimrim, Luhith und der Westrand des 'Landes Ataroth'. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Topographie des Landes Moab. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 82, 1966, pp. 163–208.
- (3036a) AVRAHAM NEGEV: Machaerus. In: RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton 1976. P. 539.
- (3036b) DAVID AMIT: Fortresses of the Desert in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). 2nd ed., Kefar Etzion 1976.
- (3036c) VIRGILIO CORBO: La fortezza di Macheronte. Rapporto preliminare della prima campagna di scavo: 8 settembre–28 ottobre 1978. In: *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 28, 1978, pp. 217–231.
- (3036d) AUGUST STROBEL: Auf der Suche nach Machärus und Kallirrhoe. Selbstzeugnisse und Dokumente zu einem geographischen Problem des 19. Jahrhunderts. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 93, 1977, pp. 247–267.

GLUECK (3032), commenting on *Antiquities* 18. 111, concludes that Josephus wrongly places Machaerus in the territory of Aretas. To escape from Machaerus to the security of her father's kingdom meant for the daughter of Aretas a flight of only a few miles. The discovery of sites with Nabataean pottery would alone have been sufficient to fix the northern boundary of the Nabataean kingdom, without recourse to Josephus.

DELCOR (3033), after summarizing in detail the history of Machaerus, notes that it still awaits methodical excavation.

STROBEL (3034) surveys the topography and history of Machaerus, including the conquest of the fortress, in the light of the ruins and the Roman circumvallation. He concludes that Josephus' account (*War* 7. 190–209) of its capture is problematical, though Josephus' account of the topography is confirmed.

STROBEL (3035) reports on explorations in 1973, especially of the Roman siegework. He includes detailed maps of the site and again discusses the validity of Josephus' account (*War* 7. 197–209) of the capture of the fortress.

SCHOTTROFF (3036), pp. 168–174, describes the situation and history of Machaerus according to Josephus and identifies it with Mkāwer.

NEGEV (3036a) has a brief survey of the chief archaeological finds at Machaerus in the light of Josephus' remarks.

AMIT (3036b), pp. 43–50, contains unannotated selections from the sources, chiefly Josephus, concerning Machaerus.

CORBO (3036c), reporting on the archaeological finds at Machaerus, from both the Hasmonean and the Herodian periods, concludes that though Josephus is confirmed in some of his remarks about the fortress, in other respects he has exaggerated, presumably in order to praise the military might of the Romans in capturing it.



STROBEL (3036d) examines recent scholarship so far as the attempt to fix the location of the Herodian fortress at Machaerus.

#### 25.14: Masada before YADIN's Excavations of 1963–65

- (3037) JOSEPH BRASLAWSKY: Masada (in Hebrew). Ein Herod 1943.
- (3038) S. AVI-YIFTAḤ: From the Chapters of Masada (in Hebrew). In: Mibbiphnim 15, 1952, pp. 479–483.
- (3039) AZARIAH ALON: Toward the Investigation of Masada (in Hebrew). In: Mibbiphnim 16, 1953, pp. 468–476.
- (3040) SHMARYAHU GUTMAN: Masada (in Hebrew). In: Yediot Ha-ḥevrah Le-ḥakirat Erez Yisrael 18, 1954, pp. 254–267.
- (3041) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Where 960 Zealots Committed Suicide Sooner than Submit to a Roman Army of 15,000; The Dead Sea Fortress Rock of Masada – Fortified by the Maccabees and Held by Herod – Now First Surveyed. In: Illustrated London News 227, Nov. 5, 1955, pp. 784–787.
- (3042) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Herod's Fortress-Palace of Masada. In: Illustrated London News 227, Nov. 12, 1955, pp. 836–839.
- (3043) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, NAḤMAN AVIGÁD, YOḤANAN AHARONI, I. DUNAYEVSKY, SHMARYAHU GUTMAN: The Archaeological Survey of Masada 1955–1956 (in Hebrew). In: Yediot Ha-ḥevrah Le-ḥakirat Erez Yisrael 21, 1957, pp. 9–77. Trans. into English in: Israel Exploration Journal 7, 1957, pp. 1–60.
- (3044) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Masada. Storia di una Fortezza (Sintesi dell'Oriente e della Bibbia, 4). Torino 1961.
- (3045) YOḤANAN AHARONI: Masada (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv, Israel Defense Forces, 1957; 2nd ed., 1959.
- (3046) IAN A. RICHMOND: The Roman Siege-works of Masada (*sic*), Israel. In: Journal of Roman Studies 52, 1962, pp. 142–155.
- (3047) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: The Circular Structure at Masada – Tomb of the Hasmonean Mariamne? (in Hebrew). In: Ha-Ummah 2, 1963, pp. 356–363.
- (3048) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Das Problem des Rundbaus auf der mittleren Terrasse des Nordpalastes des Herodes auf dem Berge Masada. Versuch einer neuen Deutung. In: Theokratia 2, 1970, pp. 45–80.
- (3049) SHMARYAHU GUTMAN: With Masada (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1964; 2nd ed., 1965.
- (3050) BENO ROTHENBERG, ed.: Masada (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1964. English version simultaneously published: Masada Based on the Story Told by Flavius Josephus. Tel-Aviv 1964.
- (3051) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Masada: A Critique of Recent Scholarship. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part 3: Judaism before 70 (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 12, part 3). Leiden 1975. Pp. 218–248.

No single event in the history of the Second Jewish Commonwealth has occasioned more discussion in recent years than the fall of Masada, the mausoleum of martyrs, as it has been called. This has given rise to a term, 'Masada complex', in discussions of the attitude of the government of the present-day State of Israel toward negotiations with the Arabs. Our age, which has seen the sprouting of radicals and terrorists in so many nations, is understandably more interested in the radical terrorists who held out for so long at Masada

against the mighty forces of Rome. The spectacular discoveries in the excavations of Masada by YADIN in a nation where digging is a veritable form of prayer have made Masada a shrine for the Jewish people.

BRASLAWSKY (3037) presents a popular general description of the visible remains in 1943.

AVI-YIFTAḤ (3038), in a popular survey, substantiates Josephus' account that there was enough water for thousands of persons; but ALON (3039) shows that Josephus himself did not understand how the supply worked.

GUTMAN (3040), reporting on an amateur ten-day survey of Masada conducted by members of Kibbutz Meuḥad in 1953, also comments on the cisterns that were discovered in confirmation of Josephus, as well as on a hall corresponding in location to Herod's palace according to Josephus' account.

AVI-YONAH (3041)(3042) presents a preliminary account in a popular vein, noting the discrepancies between Josephus and the findings of his survey, for example, the fact that the columns of Herod's palace did not turn out to be monolithic, as Josephus had asserted, and explains this by stating that the plastered surface might make them seem so to a superficial observer.

The report itself of AVI-YONAH et al. (3043), the most comprehensive archaeological survey of Masada up to that time, contains an historical sketch based almost completely on but critical of Josephus and describes at some length the remains of the palace of Herod and the water supply system, noting that the presence of cisterns confirms Josephus (War 7. 291).

AVI-YONAH (3044) presents the same material with lavish illustrations.

The pamphlet of AHARONI (3045) includes a history of Masada (mostly quotations from Josephus), as well as a popular survey of what had been excavated up to that date.

RICHMOND (3046) presents a detailed description of the Roman siege machinery, supporting Josephus where it is possible to corroborate his statements.

SCHALIT (3047)(3048) comments on the discovery at Masada in 1955 of a circular structure and conjectures that it is the grave of Mariamne; but, we may note, neither Josephus nor the Talmudic rabbis, both of whom were much interested in Mariamne's death, say anything about her being buried at Masada. SCHALIT says that if Josephus had mentioned it he would have had to tell of Herod's gruesome preservation of her body for seven years in honey, as recounted in the Talmud; but this does not necessarily follow, we may retort, and, in any case, Josephus, with his love of such delicious details, might well have seen fit to mention them if he felt impressed with their accuracy.

Though GUTMAN's (3049) popular history of Masada appeared after the start of the excavations by YADIN, he is content merely to describe the explorations and diggings at Masada before YADIN and to conclude that Josephus is confirmed in his account.

Similarly, though ROTHENBERG's (3050) popularly written and strikingly illustrated work appeared in the midst of YADIN's excavations, he has no references to these epoch-making discoveries, basing himself solely on the expedition of 1955–56.

I (3051) have presented a critical survey of research on Masada both before and especially after YADIN's excavations.

## 25.15: YADIN's Excavations of Masada

- (3052) YIGAELEL YADIN: Masada – In Those Days, in This Time (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1966. Trans. into English by MOSHE PEARLMAN: Masada: Herod's Fortress and the Zealots' Last Stand. London 1966. Trans. into French by PAUL DEVALIGNE: Masada. La dernière citadelle d'Israël. Paris 1967. Trans. into German by EVA and ARNE EGGE-BRECHT: Masada. Der letzte Kampf um die Festung des Herodes. Hamburg 1967; Zürich, Frankfurt, Stuttgart 1969. Trans. into Italian by CLARA VALENZIANO: Masada. La fortezza di Erode e l'ultima difesa degli Zeloti. Bari 1968. Trans. into Spanish by MERCEDES BALLESTEROS et al.: Masada: La fortaleza de Herodes y el último bastión de los Zelotes. Barcelona 1969. Trans. into Danish by INGER GUDMUNDSEN: Masada: Kong Herodes' faestning. Copenhagen 1971. Trans. into Dutch by R. J. DEMARÉE: Masada: Herodes burcht en het laatste bolwerk der Joden. Bussum 1971.
- (3053) YIGAELEL YADIN: Masada: Herod's Fortress-Palace and the Zealots' Last Stand. In: Illustrated London News 245, Oct. 31, 1964, pp. 693–697.
- (3054) YIGAELEL YADIN: Masada. In: Christian News from Israel 16, June 1965, pp. 23–30.
- (3055) CECIL ROTH: Qumran and Masada: A Final Clarification Regarding the Dead Sea Sect. In: Revue de Qumran 5, 1964, pp. 81–87.
- (3056) CECIL ROTH: The Dead Sea Scrolls. A New Historical Approach. New York 1965 (2nd ed. of his: The Historical Background of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford 1958).
- (3057) YIGAELEL YADIN: The Excavation of Masada – 1963/64: Preliminary Report. In: Israel Exploration Journal 15, 1965, pp. 1–120.
- (3058) YIGAELEL YADIN: Masada and the Limes. In: Israel Exploration Journal 17, 1967, pp. 43–45.
- (3059) YIGAELEL YADIN: The Story of Masada. Retold for Young Readers by Gerald Gottlieb. New York 1969.
- (3060) YIGAELEL YADIN: Masada. In: Horizon 8. 1, Winter 1966, pp. 18–31.
- (3061) YIGAELEL YADIN: Masada. In: Encyclopaedia Judaica 11, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1078–1091.
- (3062) MICAH LIVNEH: Aid for the Guide at Masada (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1965.
- (3063) MICAH LIVNEH and ZE'EV MESHEL: Masada (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1965.
- (3064) YEHUDA DEVIR: The Ideological Features of the Heroes of Masada (in Hebrew). In: Ha-Umma 4, 1966, pp. 327–346.
- (3065) AVINOAM HAIMI-COHEN: Masada of Josephus (in Hebrew). Ramat-Gan 1967.
- (3066) MOSHE PEARLMAN: The Zealots of Masada. New York 1967.
- (3067) JACOB STEIN: Heroes from the Bible: The Battle of Masada. Dayton, Ohio 1967.
- (3068) EPHRAIM TSOREF: The Works of Art in the Residential Palace of Herod (in Hebrew). In: Sinai 61, 1967, pp. 125–141.
- (3069) LUCETTE HUTEAU-DUBOIS: Les sursauts du nationalisme juif contre l'occupation romaine. De Massada à Bar Kokhba. In: Revue des Études juives 127, 1968, pp. 133–209.
- (3070) ZVI ILAN: To Masada in the Steps of the Zealots (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1968.
- (3071) ALFRED H. TAMARIN: Revolt in Judea: The Road to Masada: The Eyewitness Account by Flavius Josephus of the Roman Campaign against Judea, the Destruction of the Second Temple, and the Heroism of Masada. New York 1968.
- (3072) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: ALFRED H. TAMARIN, Revolt in Judea: The Road to Masada. In: Classical World 64, 1970–71, pp. 29–30.
- (3073) EDMUND WILSON: The Dead Sea Scrolls 1947–1969. Oxford 1969.

- (3074) GEORGE C. BRAUER, JR.: *Judaea Weeping: The Jewish Struggle against Rome from Pompey to Masada*, 63 B.C. to A.D. 73. New York 1970.
- (3075) Z. J. KAPERA: *Rękopisy z Masady. Kontekst archeologiczny-Przegląd Tręsci-Znaczenie* (= *The Manuscripts from Masada. Archaeological Context, Survey of the Contents, Significance*) (in Polish with English summary). In: *Studia z Archaologii Azji Przedniej i Starożytnego Wschodu*. Kraków 1970. Pp. 189–208.
- (3076) E. A. LA VERDIERE: *Masada – the Zealot Synagogue*. In: *Bible Today* 46, 1970, pp. 3176–3189.
- (3077) RACHEL MINC: *Massada*. In: *Bible et Vie Chrétienne* 95, 1970, pp. 75–79.
- (3078) ERWIN SPATZ: *Masada, l'Alésia d'Israël: Les nouvelles littéraires*. Paris 4 Juin 1970; cf. *Esprit et Vie* 80, 1970, pp. 411–412.
- (3079) ANNIE N. ZADOKS (JOSEPHUS JITTA): *Judea in Romeinse tijd: Masada en Herodion*. In: *Hermeneus* 42, 1970, pp. 43–46.
- (3080) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Sicarii and Masada*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 57, 1966–67, pp. 251–70.
- (3081) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Again on the Sicarii and Masada* (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron* 61, 1970, pp. 100–105.
- (3082) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Masada and the Sicarii*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 55, 1964–65, pp. 299–317.
- (3083) YITZHAK BAER: *Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.
- (3083a) YEHOASHUA BRAND: *When did the Jewish Settlement in Masada Cease?* (in Hebrew). In: *Ha-Ummah* 5, 1966–67, pp. 186–192.
- (3083b) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *New Testament History*. London 1969; New York 1971.
- (3083c) HARRY T. FRANK: *Bible, Archeology and Faith*. Nashville 1971.
- (3083d) RAPHAEL ROTHSTEIN: *The Disturbing Myth* (in Hebrew). In: *Ha-'arez*, April 20, 1973.
- (3083e) BENJAMIN KEDAR: *The Masada Complex* (in Hebrew). In: *Ha-'arez*, April 22, 1973.
- (3083f) BERNARD LEWIS: *History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented*. Princeton 1975.
- (3083g) BAILA R. SHARGEL: *The Evolution of the Masada Myth*. In: *Judaism* 28, 1979, pp. 357–371.

YADIN's epoch-making dig received tremendous coverage in the general press; exhibits of some of his findings were held in various major cities in the United States; and a small permanent museum was set up at Masada itself, which has now become, it is fair to say, one of the leading tourist attractions of Israel. Before writing his definitive account (3052), YADIN wrote several popular articles, notably (3053) and (3054), presenting the highlights of the first season of excavations and contending that the astonishing discovery of a sectarian scroll of liturgies based on the peculiar calendar in use at Qumran disproves, once and for all, the view of those such as ZEITLIN who had argued that the Dead Sea Scrolls are not genuine or are actually medieval, since such a scroll must date from before the fall of Masada. The fact, however, that Masada was occupied in Byzantine times leaves some room for doubt in the matter, at least according to ZEITLIN. YADIN resolves the question as to how a scroll belonging to the Dead Sea sect, which he identifies with the Essenes, might have made its way to Masada by suggesting, not very plausibly, in view of the high degree of non-cooperation among sectarian groups at this time, that one of the Essene groups might have taken refuge with the defenders of Masada and fought with them.

The simpler solution would, at first glance, be to follow ROTH (3055)(3056) and to identify the Dead Sea sect with the Zealots (or, more accurately, the Sicarii) and then to see this scroll as a link between the Sicarii at the Dead Sea and at Masada; but the two groups, we may note, are quite different in organization, economic, ascetic, and eschatological ideals, attitude toward war, etc.

YADIN's (3057) careful preliminary report of the excavations notes that the coins of Alexander Jannaeus provisionally establish the identity of Jonathan the priest who first fortified Masada as King Alexander Jannaeus, and that all the public buildings constructed before that date that have been excavated were burned in the great conflagration as described by Josephus.

We may, however, express our regret that YADIN has still not issued a final report on his excavations.

YADIN's (3052) major work has not only gone through a number of editions but has appeared already in eight languages. The book is truly lavishly illustrated. Its highly patriotic tone, with its thinly disguised romanticism of Israel's past, is clearly meant to strengthen Israeli patriotism and has, on these grounds, been justly criticized.

YADIN (3058) further comments on the Roman siege-camp at Masada, noting that Camp F, which he excavated, was not part of the *limes* of Diocletian but was constructed by the Roman garrison after the capture of Masada; the evidence of coins and pottery, we may remark, seems decisive in proving YADIN's contention.

YADIN's (3059) *magnum opus* was rewritten for younger readers by GOTTLIEB. YADIN himself presents a fine popular survey, lavishly illustrated, in his article in 'Horizon' (3060) and in the 'Encyclopaedia Judaica' (3061).

In the wake of YADIN's discoveries a number of works summarizing them have appeared: LIVNEH's (3062), which is an aid to guides; LIVNEH and MESHEL's (3063) work, which contains a brief history of Masada and a popular guide to YADIN's excavations; DEVIR's (3064), which concludes that YADIN's finds confirm the connection of the Masada group with the Dead Sea Sect; HAIMI-COHEN's (3065), a popular account, well illustrated from YADIN's finds, concluding that Josephus knew only a little of Masada and that at second-hand; PEARLMAN's (3066) popular and enthusiastic account concluding that Josephus' version of the Zealots (*sic*) at Masada is true; STEIN's (3067) brief, simplified summary of Josephus, with illustrations by the author and with text in English, translated into French and Hebrew; TSOREF's (3068) description of the works of art and, in particular, their Hellenistic motifs, in the residential palace of Herod excavated by YADIN; HUTEAU-DUBOIS' (3069) brief summary of the site and of the excavations; ILAN's (3070) popular account for young readers; TAMARIN's (3071) condensed and adapted version of Josephus' account, with illustrations from YADIN's excavations, which shows no awareness, as I (3072) have indicated, of the controversy as to whether Josephus' account may be trusted and whether Masada's defenders were heroes or cowards; WILSON's (3073) eminently readable and indeed fascinating chapter on Masada, based on Josephus and especially on YADIN's excavations, in his extensively revised, admittedly popular account of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in which he contends that Eleazar ben Jair's

appeal to the defenders at Masada is closer to Greek philosophy than to traditional Jewish teaching; BRAUER's (3074) popular work, which concludes that the recent excavations have shown Josephus' description of Masada to be painstakingly accurate; KAPERÁ's (3075), which I have not seen, summarizing the manuscript discoveries; LA VERDIÉRE's (3076) description of the synagogue excavated by YADIN; MINC's (3077) brief survey of the history of Masada and of the excavations of YADIN; SPATZ's (3078) comparison (which I have not seen) of Masada to Alesia, the city in Gaul defended by Vercingetorix in his last stand against Julius Caesar in 52 B.C.E.; and ZADOKS' (3079) popular survey of the history of and of the excavations at Masada.

ZEITLIN (3080) (3081) argues that YADIN's findings, including the scrolls, at Masada are medieval, dating from the reign of the Byzantine emperor Heraclius (c. 630); but the coins which have been found are predominantly from the period assigned by YADIN, though, to be sure, as ZEITLIN (3082) notes, some of them date from the Byzantine period, and some of the buildings were not completed until the Byzantine age. To argue, however, that the Masada synagogue is a misnomer on the ground that there were no special houses of worship in Judea during the Second Commonwealth, as ZEITLIN claims, is, we may remark, to disregard the statement of the Jerusalem Talmud (Megillah 3. 1) that there were 480 synagogues in Jerusalem and that of the Babylonian Talmud (Kethuboth 105a) that there were 394 at the time of the destruction of the Temple.

YADIN argues strongly that the report about what happened at Masada in Josephus (War 7. 252–406) is exact and that it is confirmed by his archaeological finds. Josephus, he concludes, may have been a miserable Jew, but he was a brilliant historian. It is this contention that has given rise to the greatest controversy with regard to Masada.

BAER (3083), in particular, has argued that the archaeological remains have shown that Josephus' descriptions are not reliable.

BRAND (3083a) argues that the Masada excavated by YADIN is from the time of Bar Kochba, as the *shekalim* found there indicate; but, we may reply, such evidence as the name 'Ben Jair' on one of the potsherds supports the view that the excavation, indeed, is from the drama described by Josephus as led by Eleazar ben Jair.

BRUCE (3083b), p. 363, concludes that the uncovering of the revolutionaries' last outpost at Masada has made it plain that, far from being the impious criminals of Josephus' portrayal, they were men of piety.

FRANK (3083c), pp. 242–246, presents an uncritical summary of Josephus' account and of the archaeological finds at Masada.

ROTHSTEIN (3083d) and KEDAR (3083e) censure YADIN's uncritical acceptance of Josephus' account of the Masada episode. ROTHSTEIN, in particular, challenges the identification of the twenty-five skeletons, supposedly of the defenders, which YADIN reburied with full military honors. He and KEDAR are critical of YADIN for viewing the defenders as heroes, inasmuch as they refused to co-operate not only with the Roman enemy but even with their fellow-Jews.

LEWIS (3083f), pp. 3–41, notes an interesting parallel between Masada and Cyrus, remarking that the commemoration of both became the foci of great national festivities. Both had been forgotten and were unknown among their own peoples and were recovered from outside sources, namely archaeology.

SHARGEL (3083g) is critical of YADIN for arranging the reinterment of the skeletons. She comments that the very title of YADIN's book in Hebrew, 'In Those Days, at This Time', is tendentious, since this is a phrase which is part of the traditional liturgy recited at Hanukkah and hence associates the defenders with the Maccabean heroes. She notes that in no instance did YADIN, in his excavation of Masada, question the credibility of Josephus.

## 25.16: The Talmud's Silence about Masada

- (3084) BERNARD HELLER: Masada and the Talmud. In: *Tradition* 10, no. 2, 1968, pp. 31–34.
- (3085) JUDAH BERGMANN: Die Stoische Philosophie und die jüdische Frömmigkeit. In: ISMAR ELBOGEN, BENZION KELLERMANN, EUGEN MITTWOCH, edd., *Festschrift zu Hermann Cohen's siebzigsten Geburtstage*. Berlin 1912. Pp. 145–166. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHEL, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York 1977. Pp. 1–22.
- (3086) AHARON KAMINKA: Studies in Bible, Talmud, and Rabbinic Literature (in Hebrew). Vol. 2. Tel-Aviv 1951. Pp. 42–69.
- (3087) HENRY A. FISCHEL: Stoicism. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 409–410.
- (3088) HENRY A. FISCHEL: Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy. A Study of Epicurea and Rhetorica in Early Midrashic Writings (*Studia post-Biblica*, 21). Leiden 1973.
- (3089) SAUL LIEBERMAN: How Much Greek in Jewish Palestine? In: ALEXANDER ALTMANN, ed., *Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University, Studies and Texts*, 1. Cambridge, Mass. 1963. Pp. 123–141. Rpt. in his: *Texts and Studies*. New York 1974. Pp. 216–234. Rpt. in: HENRY A. FISCHEL, ed., *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*. New York 1977. Pp. 325–343.
- (3090) ROBERT GORDIS: On the Heroism of the Defenders of Masada (in Hebrew). In: *Hadoar* 47, no. 40, Oct. 25, 1968, pp. 756–757.
- (3091) ZALMAN DIMITROVSKY: Masada. In: *Conservative Judaism* 22. 2, Winter 1968, pp. 36–47.
- (3092) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: The Sicarii in Masada – Glory or Infamy? In: *Tradition* 11, 1970, pp. 5–30.
- (3093) LEO GUTMAN: Letter. In: *Tradition* 10, no. 4, 1969, pp. 98–99.
- (3094) SHUBERT SPERO: In Defense of the Defenders of Masada. In: *Tradition* 11. 1, 1970, pp. 31–43.
- (3095) SAUL LIEBERMAN: *Greek in Jewish Palestine*. New York 1942.

In addition to Josephus, the only ancient writers who mention Masada are Strabo (16. 44), who speaks of the rocks and crevices in its vicinity; Pliny the Elder (*Naturalis History* 5. 73), who has a reference to the fortress Masada on a rock not far from the Dead Sea; and Solinus (third century C.E.), whose reference to the fortress of Masada (*Collectanea* 35. 12) is clearly derived from Pliny.

The suspicions of a number of scholars have been aroused by the baffling silence of the Talmud with regard to Masada. The rabbis, as HELLER (3084) notes, did praise the victims of Bethar in the revolt of Bar Kochba in 135 C.E. and hence showed that they were not opposed to military belligerency as such; but, says HELLER, the Sicarii, who were in charge of Masada, operated within a secular frame of reference and, moreover, violated Jewish law by committing mutual suicide. Hence he suggests that the rabbis wished to set up a dam by their silence against the Stoic doctrine that gave legitimacy to such a suicide.

While it is true that a number of scholars, such as BERGMANN (3085), KAMINKA (3086), and FISCHER (3087), have tried to show Stoic influence on the Talmudic rabbis, and FISCHER (3088) has now tried to demonstrate Epicurean influence as well, LIEBERMAN (3089) effectively argues that the alleged borrowings have only a superficial similarity or are commonplaces. We may add that there is no mention throughout the Talmud of the Stoics or of any of their leaders; and they were hardly a threat to Judaism, as apparently the Epicureans were. Moreover, even Josephus, who so bitterly denounced the Sicarii, acknowledges that they, far from operating within a secular frame of reference, stressed the point, as we see, for example, in their behavior under torture in Egypt (War 7. 418–419), that their key doctrine was their refusal to accept anyone other than G-d as their master, a view which they shared with the Fourth Philosophy (Ant. 18. 23–25), with whom they are usually identified and from whose founder, Judas the Galilaeen, Eleazar, the leader of the Sicarii at Masada, was descended (War 7. 253).

HELLER (3084), furthermore, suggests that the rabbis' silence is due to their opposition to martyrdom when impelled by excessive zeal and especially to mutual suicide such as occurred at Masada.

GORDIS (3090) notes that the Hasmoneans are also only very slightly mentioned in Talmudic literature, but this is, we may suggest, largely because of the rabbis' intractable opposition to them. The rabbis, we may note, are silent about the Dead Sea sect(s) and the Essenes, as well as about Philo and Josephus. The Talmud is not a history book, nor is it primarily concerned with theology as such. Moreover, the rabbis are generally, though not always, circumspect in references to the Romans.

DIMITROVSKY (3091) says that the omission of Masada from rabbinic literature may, in part, be due to the rabbis' fear of the Romans; but Josephus, we may remark, who certainly has great regard for the Romans, not only does not omit the incident but sets it forth at great length. In any case, the rabbis were not afraid to speak very negatively about such figures as Titus (Giṭṭin 56b–57a). DIMITROVSKY concludes that the primary reason for the silence is the new policy of political passivity developed at Yavneh after the fall of Jerusalem in 70, which objected to suicide for even the noblest of purposes; but, we may note, that this was not a new policy is clear from the initial opposition of the greatest rabbinic leaders, Joḥanan ben Zakkai and his followers (Giṭṭin 56a), to the activists who had brought on the war with Rome.

HOENIG (3092) takes a point of view opposite to that of DIMITROVSKY, declaring that the Talmud's silence is due to the disdain of the rabbis toward their



attitude of resignation in a situation where they should have put up a vigorous defense, although indications from the Talmud, we may remark, show that most rabbis were in favor of peace with the Romans.

GUTMAN (3093) more plausibly suggests that rabbinic opposition may have been due to the heterodox calendar of the sectaries; there were fierce debates during this period with regard to the calendar, as we see, for example, in the dispute between Rabbi Joshua ben Ḥananiah and Rabban Gamaliel (Rosh Hash-anah 5a). The very fact that the Sicarii, who appear from YADIN's excavations to have been ultra-religious in observing the laws of purity and of tithing, engaged in a raid on Ein Gedi on Passover (War 4. 402), when such raids would be strictly prohibited according to Jewish law, may be explained by the suggestion that, according to the calendar of the Sicarii, it was not Passover.

SPERO (3094) elucidates the Talmud's silence by correctly noting that the Talmud is not a systematic chronicle of historical events, and that since Masada involved relatively few people, it was considered a minor event. Josephus, for his own reasons, we may add, may have chosen to inflate its importance, but the truth is that the war had long since ended, as the Romans realized by delaying this mopping-up operation; and the episode had no great military or political significance. As to SPERO's suggestion that the rabbis omitted it because their last memory of the revolutionaries in connection with the civil war in Jerusalem had not been pleasant, the rabbis do not shy away from mentioning unpleasant matters, as we see in their long digression about the siege of Jerusalem (Giṭṭin 55b–58a); but their concern with Jerusalem is explained by the fact that the Temple was in Jerusalem, whereas Masada had no religious significance.

In any case, the rabbis are not silent about the Sicarii, whom they mention negatively (Mishnah, Makhshirin 1. 6 and 'Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan, version B, chap. 7, ed. SCHECHTER, p. 20). As to why they do not mention Masada, we may find a clue, as noted above, in LIEBERMAN (3095), pp. 179–184, who cites a Midrashic passage ('Shir ha-Shirim Zuta', end) in connection with the Roman attack on Jerusalem, recording that as a result of the dissension between Menahem and Hillel, Menahem left with eight hundred students. Now, Josephus (War 2. 433) remarks that Menahem, the son of that Judas the Galilaeen who was the founder of the Fourth Philosophy, left at one point for Masada with his followers to obtain weapons during the rebel siege of Herod's palace in Jerusalem in 66, and returned only to be murdered, after which a few of his followers, including his relative Eleazar ben Jair, succeeded in escaping to Masada (War 2. 447), where they entrenched themselves until the fateful Roman attack in 74. The Midrashic text speaks of the students of Menahem as dressed in golden "scale armor". The text is apparently corrupt, and we may suggest that one of the manuscript readings, *serikonin* ("silk dresses") is close to *Sicarii* (*Sikarin* in Mishnah, Makshirin 1. 6). The number 800 is close to the 967 (including women and children) mentioned by Josephus as being at Masada in 74 (War 7. 399–400). The Midrashic text does not speak of the murder of Menahem, but it does mention the murders of Ḥanin ben Matron and Elḥanan, the latter by Eleazar and his students; Josephus (War 2. 443) speaks of the murder of Ananias, who apparently is the same as Ḥanin, by Menahem's brigands, and the murder in turn

of Menahem by Eleazar and his partisans. We may thus have an oblique reference to the events surrounding the departure of the Sicarii for Masada.

### 25.17: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: General

- (3096) MENAHEM STERN: Zealots. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica Year Book* 1973. Jerusalem 1973. Pp. 135–152.
- (3097) GÜNTHER BAUMBACH: Die Zeloten – ihre geschichtliche und religionspolitische Bedeutung. In: *Bibel und Liturgie* 41, 1968, pp. 2–25. Trans. into English (abridged): The Significance of the Zealots. In: *Theology Digest* 17, 1969, pp. 241–246.
- (3098) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Masada, Josephus and Yadin. In: *Jewish Spectator* 32, no. 8, Oct. 1967, pp. 2–8, 30–32.
- (3099) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Taking It for Granted. In: *Jewish Spectator* 32, no. 9, Nov. 1967, pp. 31–32.
- (3100) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Letter. In: *Conservative Judaism* 22, Spring 1968, pp. 84–89.
- (3101) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Masada Revisited. In: *Jewish Spectator* 34, Dec. 1969, pp. 3–5, 29–32.
- (3102) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Letter. In: *Commentary* 56, Oct. 1973, p. 4.
- (3103) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Masada: A Critique of Recent Scholarship. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part 3: Judaism before 70* (*Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity*, vol. 12, part 3). Leiden 1975. Pp. 218–248.
- (3104) WILHELM WEBER: *Josephus und Vespasian*. Stuttgart 1921.
- (3105) ADALBERT BRIESSMANN: Tacitus und das Flavische Geschichtsbild. Wiesbaden 1955.
- (3106) AUGUST STROBEL: Die Passa-Erwartung als urchristliches Problem in Lc 17, 20f. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 49, 1958, pp. 157–196.
- (3107) EDWARD R. LEVENSON: *New Tendentious Motifs in Antiquities: A Study of Development in Josephus' Historical Thought*. Diss., M.A., Columbia University, New York 1966.
- (3108) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus: Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Gießen 1920.
- (3109) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Studies in Josephus*. London 1961.
- (3110) VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZY: La mort d'Éléazar fils de Jaïre et les courants apologétiques dans le *De Bello Judaico* de Flavius Josèphe. In: *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*. Paris 1971. Pp. 461–490.
- (3111) HELGO LINDNER: Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im *Bellum Judaicum*: Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage (*Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums*, 12). Leiden 1972.
- (3112) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (3112a) RAYMOND L. COX: Israel Remembers Her Super Alamo! In: *Christianity Today* 17, 1973, pp. 1230–1233.
- (3112b) JEAN HITTE: Massada. La fantastique histoire du drama de Massada. In: *Cahiers de 'La Terre Sainte'*, Jerusalem 1973, pp. 10–14.
- (3112c) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Gamla in Gaulanitis. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 92, 1976, pp. 54–71.
- (3112d) DAVID AMIT: *Fortresses of the Desert in the Days of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). 2nd ed., Kefar Etzion 1976.
- (3112e) AVRAHAM NEGEV: Masada. In: RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton 1976. Pp. 555–556.

- (3112f) E. MARY SMALLWOOD: *The Jews under Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian.* Leiden 1976.
- (3112g) PIERRE VIDAL-NAQUET: *Flavius Josèphe et Masada.* In: *Revue historique* 260, 1978, pp. 3–21.
- (3112h) BAILA R. SHARGEL: *The Evolution of the Masada Myth.* In: *Judaism* 28, 1979, pp. 357–371.
- (3112i) YEHUDA DEVIR: *The Ideological Character of the Heroes of Masada (in Hebrew).* In: *Ha-Ummah* 4, 1966, pp. 327–346.

Most students of Josephus have noted that he cannot be relied upon, particularly in matters in which he himself was involved. Thus, as STERN (3096) rightly notes, Josephus is hardly credible with regard to the events in Galilee and, in particular, with regard to John of Gischala, who, despite Josephus, can hardly be claimed as the mouthpiece of the radical elements, inasmuch as he maintained excellent relations with the moderate Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel. It is, moreover, likely, as STERN correctly argues, that there was a strong Messianic element in the great revolt against Rome, of which we get only slight hints in Josephus in such figures as Simon bar Giora and in such a statement as the following (War 6. 312, echoed in Tacitus, *Histories* 5. 13 and Suetonius, *Vespasian* 4): “What more than all else incited them to the war was an ambiguous oracle, likewise found in the sacred Scriptures, to the effect that at that time one from their country would become ruler of the world”. There is no evidence, however, to support BAUMBACH (3097) in his suggestion that at Masada Eleazar, whom he regards as a Zealot, had deposed Menahem, a member of the Sicarii, because of Messianic claims which he ascribed to the latter.

The question of Josephus’ reliability as a source for Masada has been raised particularly by WEISS-ROSMARIN (3098) (3099) (3100) (3101) (3102) in a series of popular articles, notably (3098) and (3101), and letters which have received much publicity in the general press. The fact that these articles are popular and presented in a polemical spirit does not mean that the arguments in them may be disregarded. WEISS-ROSMARIN argues that YADIN is overly much involved emotionally with Josephus’ account of Masada and hence cannot be truly objective. Among the chief points in her contention that Josephus’ account of Masada is a conscious fabrication and that there was no mass suicide are the following:

1. Josephus is, in general, a biased, unreliable historian, commissioned by the Romans to write the official history of the war for propagandistic purposes.
2. The excavations reveal several errors in detail in Josephus, who, after all, was not present during the siege of Masada. Can we trust him for other details when we cannot check him through the excavations?
3. Josephus’ ‘War’, which is our sole source for the events at Masada, is a biased, official version, calculated to please the Romans and, in particular, the Flavians, who, starting with Vespasian and continuing through Domitian, held the throne. This version was intended to prove that the Jewish Sicarii at Masada were cowards who, when confronted with the necessity of meeting the Romans on the field of battle, opted to commit suicide. There were, moreover, few if

any Roman soldiers who had besieged Masada who had returned to Rome and were in a position to challenge the veracity of Josephus' account.

4. Josephus' account, by his own admission (War 7. 404), rests upon the witness of a single woman who had managed to hide in a subterranean aqueduct. How could she thus have heard and seen what transpired above ground?

These points may be answered, as I (3103) have elsewhere suggested, as follows:

1. It is true that the very title, 'Concerning the Jewish War', i.e., the war against the Jews, shows that Josephus is writing from the standpoint of the Romans; and Josephus makes clear that his work is a warning to the Jews on the futility of further opposition to the Romans. Moreover, Josephus' source for much of the 'War', as WEBER (3104) maintained, is a Flavian work which sought to extol the Flavian dynasty. BRIESSMANN (3105), comparing Josephus and Tacitus where they treat of the same persons or events, concludes that Josephus displayed servile acceptance of the Flavians' every deed. The fact that the Roman commander at Masada was a Flavian, L. Flavius Silva, meant that Josephus, who had such a close relationship to the Flavians that he even adopted the name Flavius, probably had access to the commentaries which Silva, like many generals of the time, may have written; but it also meant that Josephus would probably slant his account in Silva's favor.

STROBEL (3106) has argued that Josephus deliberately omitted the Messianic aspects of the Masada episode, notably that it took place on Passover (War 7. 401); but the fact that the group engaged in a raid on Ein Gedi on Passover (War 4. 402) indicates that it had a different calendar or view of Passover. Moreover, since the defenders at Masada were Sicarii, whom Josephus so hated and despised, he had no reason for covering up their Messianic goals.

LEVENSON (3107) has suggested that Josephus' praise of the Sicarii at Masada indicates that Josephus added much of the section on Masada as a supplement to a later draft of the 'War', after his attitude to the insurgents had changed; and, indeed, LAQUEUR (3108), p. 76, and SHUTT (3109), p. 124, note that Josephus apparently started altering some of his statements in the 'War'; but, we may comment, there is a difference between an editorial revision of the language of a statement and a basic change in outlook, as in Josephus' sudden admiration for the Sicarii, especially in view of the contempt that he again shows for the terrorists in the later 'Antiquities'.

NIKIPROWETZKY (3110) has also stressed that the account of the death of Eleazar contains three apologetic currents running through the 'War': the deprecation of the religious and political liberation movement in viewing the war against the background of unfavorable oracles, an expression of the imperial Roman mystique, and the idea that the Roman power is destined to be destroyed by the Messiah (the last, we may comment, certainly goes beyond the evidence).

We may add that the motif of mutual suicide appears to be a recurring one in ancient literature and thus may not be historical. As Prof. GERALD J. BLIDSTEIN of Ben-Gurion University, Beersheva, Israel, has suggested to the writer in a letter, we may point to Thucydides 3. 81, where the Messenians are re-

ported to have committed mutual suicide in the face of the attack of the Coryraeans, and to *Antiquities* 13.363–364, where the Gazaeans committed mutual suicide when attacked by Alexander Jannaeus. We may add that, according to Dio Cassius (66.6.3), some of the defenders of the Temple in 70 committed mutual suicide, a detail not found in Josephus.

LINDNER (3111) declares that Josephus used as a source a Greek military report from the Roman army.

Moreover, there are many discrepancies between the 'War' and the 'Antiquities' and between the 'War' and 'Life' where they treat of the same events. It is true, in addition, that his opponents (*Against Apion* 1.53) maligned Josephus' history in critical terms similar to those employed by Thucydides in his attack on his predecessors, namely, for writing a prize composition such as is set for boys at school. It is also true, as Josephus himself admits (*Against Apion* 1.50), that he employed certain collaborators to help him with the Greek of the 'War'; and they may well have embellished the account. But, as that excellent judge of Josephus' style, THACKERAY (3112), p. 105, remarks, Book 7 of the 'War', of which the Masada episode forms a considerable portion, stands apart from the other books, especially in vocabulary, and it would seem that Josephus was thrown more upon his own resources, though we may conjecture that he simply had a different and more thorough assistant. But Josephus is listed by TOYNBEE, together with Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Polybius, as one of the five greatest historians who wrote in Greek. Moreover, he had the advantage of viewing the war from the standpoint of both belligerents. The fact that he had so many enemies and rivals meant that he had to be particularly careful of what and how he wrote. In addition, he would have built up *Silva* to a greater degree if he had depicted the Jewish defenders as fighting to the last man.

2. It is true that Josephus says, for example, that Herod's palace was on the western slope, whereas it is actually on the northern slope, but this may be due to the fact that the best view of the palace is from the west of Masada, from which the palace is seen as being on the western slope inclining to the north, as indeed Josephus describes it. Again, Josephus says that the pillars of Herod's palace were cut from a single block, whereas the columns found by YADIN had been made up of several sections fitted together and then covered with stucco so that the joints would not be seen. Moreover, Josephus says that the food of the defenders was preserved, whereas YADIN found that some of it had been preserved, but that part of it had been burnt. But these are, one must admit, minor details; the excavations as a whole strongly confirm Josephus' description.

3. Josephus' intention is clearly not to prove that the Sicarii were cowards. Even though he stresses their cruelty and avarice in the blackest terms (*War* 7.256), he admits (*War* 7.405) that their act of suicide showed amazing fortitude; and when the Romans entered Masada they admired the nobility of their resolve and the unwavering contempt of death which they displayed in carrying it out. Again, in his account of the torture of the Sicarii in Egypt, Josephus (*War* 7.418–419) admits that the spectators were deeply affected by the strength of the courage which they, and especially their children, showed. As to the possibility of Roman soldiers who had been at Masada being able to question Jo-

sephus' account after their return to Rome, we must not forget that the 'War' was probably published sometime between 75 and 79 C.E., very shortly after the fall of Masada (74 C.E.), first in an Aramaic and then in a Greek version. Because of his role in the war and his privileged position in Rome Josephus was, as he himself tells us in his 'Life' (424), constantly subject to criticism, envy, and danger. A misleading account of such a spectacular event as that which occurred at Masada would have led to charges that this was another example of his unreliability as an historian; but there is no such indication in his 'Life'. Moreover, the Tenth Legion had between six and ten thousand troops at Masada, as well as between ten and fifteen thousand prisoners of war to bear supplies. Surely some of these soldiers might have returned to Rome after the siege, and many of the prisoners similarly might have been brought to the city of Rome. While it is true that, in all probability, if ancient practice is a guide, not many manuscripts of the 'War' were copied from Josephus' original during his lifetime, Josephus says that he presented copies not only to Vespasian and Titus but also to many others, some of whom had taken part in the war (Life 361–362).

4. The woman who is the source of Josephus' account is decried by Josephus, who is not otherwise known for his admiration for the intellectual power of women, as "superior in sagacity and training to most of her sex". Inasmuch as memories were highly cultivated in antiquity, especially among Jews, she might have retained much of the speeches. Moreover, the acoustics in these underground sewers are excellent.

COX (3112a) presents a brief popular summary of the stand at Masada and its significance for Israel today.

HITTE (3112b), in an elementary popular and romanticized account, naively praises Josephus, asserting that the excavations at Masada confirm his veracity.

BAR-KOCHVA (3112c) notes that Josephus' topographical descriptions are precise but that they are unusually incomplete. As an example he cites Josephus' failure to mention Herod's great palace in his detailed description of Masada (War 7. 280–319), despite the emphasis in the same passage on Herod's building program.

AMIT (3112d), pp. 51–62, contains unannotated selections from Josephus concerning Masada.

NEGEV (3112e) systematically surveys the principal buildings and other finds excavated at Masada. He notes that the Roman siege works are in reality much more complicated than those referred to by Josephus.

SMALLWOOD (3112f), p. 338, quotes a statement which MORTON SMITH made orally without committing himself, in which he asked whether in fact when Silva's men broke in they themselves set fire to the buildings and killed everyone, that the few who hid out starved to death, and that Josephus' story is a myth serving the patriotic purpose of covering up the disgrace of the final Jewish surrender and at the same time the apologetic purpose of absolving the Romans of the barbarity of a final massacre of women and children. We may add that if so this should be seen as parallel to Josephus' account of the burning of the Temple, which absolves Titus of responsibility, as compared with the

account in Sulpicius Severus, which blames Titus. We may, however, respond by noting that Josephus' account makes heroes of the Sicarii, whereas we should never expect Josephus to do so, in view of his deep-seated hostility toward them, unless the account were indeed true. Moreover, YADIN's discovery of lots, including one with the name Ben Jair on it, is uncanny confirmation of Josephus' account.

VIDAL-NAQUET (3112g) distinguishes the Zealots from the Sicarii, the occupiers of Masada, and criticizes YADIN for confusing the two groups. He notes the parallels between Josephus' description and YADIN's excavations.

SHARGEL (3112h) stresses that Josephus relied on second-hand sources, most likely Roman, for his account of Masada.

DEVIR (3112i) seeks to establish a tie between the Sicarii at Masada and the later followers of Bar Kochba.

## 25.18: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: the Speeches of Eleazar ben Jair

- (3113) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Letter. In: *Conservative Judaism* 22, Spring 1968, pp. 84–89.
- (3114) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Masada Revisited. In: *Jewish Spectator* 34, Dec. 1969, pp. 3–5, 29–32.
- (3115) OTTO BAUERNFEIND and OTTO MICHEL: Die beiden Eleazarreden in Jos. bell. 7, 323–336; 7, 341–388. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 58, 1967, pp. 267–272.
- (3116) WILLY MOREL: Eine Rede bei Josephus. (Bell. Iud. VII 341sq.). In: *Rheinisches Museum* 75, 1926, pp. 106–114.
- (3117) JAN N. SEVENSTER: Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known? Leiden 1968.
- (3118) JOHN M. ALLEGRO: The Sacred Mushroom and the Cross: A Study of the Nature and Origins of Christianity within the Fertility Cults of the Ancient Near East. Garden City, New York 1970.
- (3119) HELGO LINDNER: Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus im Bellum Iudaeum. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 12). Leiden 1972.
- (3119a) SHLOMO SIMONSOHN: Afterword. In: SALO W. BARON and GEORGE S. WISE, ed., *Violence and Defense in the Jewish Experience*. Philadelphia 1977. Pp. 337–343.
- (3119b) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Josephus' 'Eleazar Speech' and Historical Credibility. In: *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, vol. 1, ed. A. SHINAN. Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 417–427. Rpt. in *Jewish Spectator* 46, Spring 1981, pp. 4–9.
- (3119c) PIERRE VIDAL-NAQUET: Flavius Josèphe et Masada. In: *Revue historique* 260, 1978, pp. 3–21.

The speeches put into the mouth of Eleazar ben Jair are, says WEISS-ROSMARIN (3113)(3114), typical of ancient authors who were fond of inventing such set speeches, full of pathos, for their leading characters. Such speeches were penned, she says, in Josephus' scriptorium in Rome.

Set speeches, we may respond, though they are oratorical displays serving the general propagandist purpose of the work, are found in such 'scientific'

histories as those of Thucydides, who remarks (1. 22) that he has put into the mouth of his speakers whatever, in his opinion, was demanded by the occasion, while, of course, adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they had really said.

In particular, the two-fold speech of Eleazar, like Josephus' two-fold speech before the walls of Jerusalem (War 5. 362–374, 376–419) seems artificially contrived. BAUERNFEIND and MICHEL (3115) have shown that the two speeches have a clearly rhetorical relationship to each other: the first is a homogeneous, logical, sermonic, historical review, while the second is a repetition of the motif of the first, with added rhetorical elements derived from Hellenistic diatribe, as well as didactic and eschatological elements, with both speeches containing traditional Jewish material (for example, the groups of ten who accomplish the sacrifice; cf. Ruth 4. 2) that has been Hellenized for Josephus' own ends.

MOREL (3116) had already noted that Eleazar's second speech closely corresponds, often even verbatim, with passages in Plato, particularly in the statements about the relation of the body and the soul and the nature of immortality. And yet, that Eleazar would have had such knowledge and would have expressed himself in such terms seems very unlikely in view of the negative attitude of pious Jews toward the study of other languages and literatures, as remarked by Josephus (Ant. 20. 264): "Our people do not favor those persons who have mastered the speech of many nations, or who adorn their style with smoothness of diction, because they consider that not only is such skill common to ordinary freemen but that even slaves who so choose may acquire it." Though it is clear from inscriptional evidence, as SEVENSTER (3117) has shown, that a basic knowledge of Greek may be assumed among many Jews of the land of Israel, Josephus is probably not wide of the mark when he states (Ant. 20. 265) that scarcely two or three of his fellow countrymen had succeeded in mastering the language. The fact that the rabbis, in view of an incident during the civil war between Aristobulus and Hyrcanus (63 B.C.E.) declared accursed a man who teaches his son Greek wisdom (Sotah 49b, Baba Kamma 82b, Menahoth 64b) meant that such study might be undertaken only under special circumstances, such as was the case for the house of Rabban Gamaliel, who had permission to teach Greek because of their relation with the Roman government. In any case, mastery of the language, such as is shown in Eleazar's speech, was hardly likely for a pious Jew. In addition, as BAUERNFEIND and MICHEL remark, the second speech has a number of stock rhetorical elements derived from Hellenistic diatribe.

ALLEGRO (3118), pp. 179–184, contends that Eleazar ben Jair's view that the soul can roam at will once the body is asleep is a belief behind a drug philosophy with which he connects the Sicarii.

LINDNER (3119), after a careful comparison of three great speeches in the "War", those of Agrippa II (2. 345–404), Josephus (5. 362–419), and Eleazar ben Jair (7. 323–388), notes that all stress the same theme, that Roman rule and the war show G-d's judgment in a deterministic and apocalyptic sense, so that one cannot avoid the conclusion that Josephus placed his theological stamp upon the discussion. But, we may comment, such themes are hardly restricted to Jo-



sephus. LINDNER notes that Eleazar's second speech recapitulates and intensifies the first, and that Josephus is indebted for a number of motifs to the rhetorical and philosophical schools. All that we may reasonably be sure of is that speeches were reworked in Josephus' scriptorium with the aid of the assistants that he employed (Against Apion 1. 50) to improve the style of his work. It does not mean that Eleazar did not speak; in fact, as BAUERNFEIND and MICHEL have shown, the speeches contain some traditional Jewish material which has been Hellenized. We have here, then, we may remark, the same kind of process at work that we see in Josephus' Hellenized reworking of the Bible in the first half of the 'Antiquities'.

SIMONSOHN (3119a) comments on the attitude toward martyrdom, especially as seen in Eleazar ben Jair's first speech (War 7. 323–336), with its emphasis on political independence and national pride, as contrasted with Josephus' version of it.

<sup>1</sup> WEISS-ROSMARIN (3119b) continues to argue that the defenders of Masada were guerrilla fighters rather than martyrs, that Josephus' account was intended to flatter his Roman masters, and that the thought of his own traitorship troubled his conscience, hence his craving for catharsis for what he had done at Jotapata to his men by arguing that he had thus procured immortal glory for them.

VIDAL-NAQUET (3119c) elucidates Ben Jair's speeches with the help of Jewish apocalyptic literature and remarks that the theme of the speeches is not the fall of Masada and the ruin of the Jewish state but the end of the Jewish people. He concludes that it is against this spirit of apocalypse that the entire recital of Josephus was written. We may, however, remark that the language of the speeches is hardly distinctive of apocalyptic. Instead, the speeches are a direct appeal to the defenders to commit suicide.

## 25.19: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: the Suicide

- (3120) GEORG SIEGMUND: Massenselbstmord des jüdischen Volkes. In his: Sein oder Nicht-sein. Die Frage des Selbstmordes. 2nd ed., Trier 1970. Pp. 79–91.
- (3121) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Masada, Josephus and Yadin. In: Jewish Spectator 32, no. 8, Oct. 1967, pp. 2–8, 30–32.
- (3122) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Masada Revisited. In: Jewish Spectator 34, Dec. 1969, pp. 3–5, 29–32.
- (3123) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Talking It for Granted. In: Jewish Spectator 32, no. 9, Nov. 1967, pp. 31–32.
- (3124) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: Letter. In: Conservative Judaism 22, Spring 1968, pp. 84–89.
- (3125) SAMUEL H. WEINGARTEN: The Mikveh at Masada (a Consideration of Halakhah) (in Hebrew). In: Sinai 67, 1969–70, pp. 83–93.
- (3126) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 3, The Jewish War, Books IV–VII (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1928.
- (3127) SHLOMO GOREN: The Valor of Masada in the Light of Halakhah (in Hebrew). In: Maḥanayim 87, 1964, pp. 7–12.
- (3128) ZVI KOLITZ: Masada: Suicide or Murder? In: Tradition 12. 1, 1971, pp. 5–26.

- (3129) LEVI YITZHAK (= LOUIS I.) RABINOWITZ: The Suicide of the Zealots of Masada (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 55, 1964, pp. 329–332.
- (3130) LOUIS I. RABINOWITZ: Letter. In: *Tradition* 13, 1971, pp. 138–139.
- (3131) LOUIS I. RABINOWITZ: The Masada Martyrs according to the Halakhah. In: *Tradition* 11, 1970, pp. 31–37.
- (3132) DOV I. FRIMER: Masada – in the Light of Halakhah. In: *Tradition* 12, 1971, pp. 27–43.
- (3133) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: The Zealots: the Case for Revaluation. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 61, 1971, pp. 155–170.
- (3134) MENAHEM STERN: Zealots. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica Year Book 1973*. Jerusalem 1973. Pp. 135–152.
- (3135) ROBERT GORDIS: The Unsullied Saga of Masada. In: *Hadassah Magazine* 49, no. 4, Dec. 1967, pp. 12–13, 27–28.
- (3136) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58, 1967–68, pp. 173–203.
- (3137) JUDAH ROSENTHAL: On Masada and Its Heroes (in Hebrew). In: *Hadoar* 47, no. 38, Sept. 30, 1968, pp. 693–695.
- (3138) HAYYIM ORLAN: More on Masada and Its Heroes (in Hebrew). In: *Hadoar* 47, no. 40, Oct. 25, 1968, pp. 755–756.
- (3139) HAYYIM ORLAN: Masada – the Historical Chapter That Has Been Invented (in Hebrew). In: *Hadoar* 48, no. 18, Feb. 28, 1969, p. 277.
- (3140) ROBERT GORDIS: On the Heroism of the Defenders of Masada (in Hebrew). In: *Hadoar* 47, no. 40, Oct. 25, 1968, pp. 756–757.
- (3141) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Masada – An Inglorious Chapter in Jewish History (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron* 59, 1968, pp. 51–60.
- (3142) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: Again on Masada (in Hebrew). In: *Hadoar* 49, Apr. 25, 1969, p. 396.
- (3143) HAYYIM ORLAN: More on the Undermining in Place of the Remembering of the Valor of Masada (in Hebrew). In: *Hadoar* 48, Sept. 19, 1969, pp. 685–686.
- (3144) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: The Sicarii in Masada – Glory or Infamy? In: *Tradition* 11, 1970, pp. 5–30.
- (3145) HAYYIM ORLAN: On the Answers of Professor Zeitlin on the Sicarii (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron* 62, 1970, pp. 22–24.
- (3146) SHUBERT SPERO: In Defense of the Defenders of Masada. In: *Tradition* 11. 1, 1970, pp. 31–43.
- (3147) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: Historic Masada and the Halakhah. In: *Tradition* 13. 2, Fall 1972, pp. 100–115.
- (3148) MARTIN HENGEL: Zeloten und Sikarier: Zur Frage nach der Einheit und Vielfalt der jüdischen Befreiungsbewegung 6–74 nach Christus. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 175–196.
- (3149) ROBERT ALTER: The Masada Complex. In: *Commentary* 56, July 1973, pp. 19–24.
- (3150) WOLF WIRGIN: Letter in: *Jewish Spectator* 33, April 1968, p. 27.
- (3150a) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Rebuttal. In: *Bitzaron* 62, 1970–71, pp. 25–29.
- (3150b) SIDNEY GOLDSTEIN: Suicide in Biblical, Exegetical and Rabbinical Literature. Diss., Yeshiva University, New York 1978.
- (3150c) VIRGINIA L. TRIMBLE: Masada, Suicide, and Halakhah. In: *Conservative Judaism* 31, 1977, pp. 45–55.
- (3150d) PIERRE VIDAL-NAQUET: Flavius Josèphe et Masada. In: *Revue historique* 260, 1978, pp. 3–21.
- (3150e) LEON D. HANKOFF: Flavius Josephus: Suicide and Transition. In: *New York State Journal of Medicine* 79, 1979, pp. 937–942.

As to the suicide of the defenders of Masada, SIEGMUND (3120) has presented a popular retelling of Josephus' version.

WEISS-ROSMARIN (3121)(3122) has raised a number of objections to Josephus' version of the suicide:

1. Although the wall of Masada was breached, the breach was in one place only and could have been successfully defended, at least for a time, by several hundred determined fighters well equipped with arms, as we know the defenders were, and in a position of strategic superiority. Moreover, as Josephus says and as the excavations show, they had plenty of food and water.

2. Fighters of valor, as the Romans judged those at Masada to be, do not commit suicide even in a hopeless situation. They fight to the last man, as, for example, Leonidas and his three hundred Spartans did at Thermopylae. The account of the suicide is pathos, not history. Orthodox Jews, such as the defenders of Masada, are forbidden to commit suicide except when they are forced to worship idols, to commit illicit sexual acts, or to commit murder.

3. History does not record a single case of armed Jews committing suicide rather than fighting. The analogy with the medieval Jewish martyrs who committed suicide is inapplicable, says WEISS-ROSMARIN (3123), since the Sicarii were seasoned guerrilla fighters, armed to the teeth, and in a strategically superior position. The example of the Jews fighting the Nazis, even despite overwhelming odds, in the battle of the Warsaw ghetto is particularly well known.

4. Josephus' account cannot be correct, for the Romans would have regarded suicide by fully armed men as cowardice.

5. Josephus may well have fabricated the story of the suicide because he felt guilty for having led thirty-nine of his men into suicide at Jotapata. By praising the mass suicide of the defenders Josephus attempted to show that at Jotapata he had, in fact, bestowed immortal glory upon them.

6. A fiction about mass suicide at Masada could not but be gratifying to Flavius Silva, the Roman commander; for it proved that the Sicarii's four-year defiance of the Romans was possible only because of the inaccessibility of Masada, but that once Silva had been appointed general he quickly succeeded in building the assault ramp, and the Sicarii realized that they were doomed.

7. In view of the nature of Masada, with its numerous natural hiding places and fortified locations, the defenders could have carried on guerrilla warfare for a long time. Even after the wall had been breached they might easily have overpowered the Roman guards at night in a surprise attack. Moreover, says WEISS-ROSMARIN (3124), the defenders had ample opportunity thus to spirit away their wives and children from Masada before the final showdown.

8. Despite Josephus, it is unlikely, in such a combat fashion, that many of the fighters were joined by their families.

9. Josephus (War 7. 387) quotes Eleazar ben Jair as saying that "our laws" enjoin mutual suicide, whereas Jewish law forbids suicide under such circumstances. Inasmuch as the defenders were, as we see from the excavations, extremely loyal to the Jewish commandments, to the extent of building ritual pools according to the traditional specifications, as WEINGARTEN (3125), who actually

inspected the ritual pools (*mikvaoth*), has shown, and inasmuch as they observed the laws of tithing, it is hard to imagine that they would commit murder in mere anticipation of what might happen.

10. The skeletal remains discovered by YADIN are not necessarily, as he claimed, those of the defenders. They may be those of the builders of the palace or of those who died fighting during the last siege or of those who died during the previous seven years during which the Sicarii had occupied Masada. Moreover, why were only twenty-five skeletons found, when Josephus asserted that the victims numbered 960? The remains of the last defenders of Masada were not found and will not be found because they died fighting.

11. If, indeed, there was a mass suicide, why were the skeletons not found in caves or in the form of burial accepted in the Biblical period and for centuries thereafter? Why, moreover, did the Romans not fill the cave to capacity?

12. Inasmuch as three skeletons were found in a private apartment in the casement wall, this raises a number of questions: Did the men kill their wives and children in their private apartments? How could the last of the defenders have inspected 150 apartments and 959 bodies? Why should the Romans in removing the corpses of the last defenders of Masada have overlooked this one casement room?

13. The fact that some of the casement apartments were found burned while others were intact seems to indicate that, contrary to what Josephus says, some of the defenders died fighting in hand-to-hand combat.

14. YADIN found eleven ostraca with names inscribed on them, including one with the name Ben Jair, and concluded, from the fact that they were all discovered in one spot and were completely different from all other ostraca at Masada, that these were probably the very lots that were used in determining who should have the gruesome tasks of slaying fellow Sicarii and their families. But, says WEISS-ROSMARIN, the Jews cast lots with stones, not ostraca; and there should have been either many more than eleven or only ten, since Josephus says explicitly (War 7. 395) that ten were chosen by lot to dispatch the rest.

We may reply to these points as follows:

1. It is true that the walls of Masada were breached in one place only, and, in fact, we may add that, according to Josephus, though this is not indicated in THACKERAY'S (3126) translation (War 7. 310), p. 593, the wall was only in part brought down. But, as YADIN, himself the former commander-in-chief of the armed forces of the State of Israel, indicated in a private letter to the author, the very fact that the Romans had concentrated their battering-rams, catapults, and archers at one spot rendered the other parts of the fort, with all its might, useless. The number of defenders, we must remember, could not have exceeded two or three hundred men.

2. The analogy with Leonidas is not a sound one, for he had a Sparta behind him and thus accomplished a great deal by inflicting heavy casualties upon the Persians and by thus delaying them, consequently gaining valuable time for the Athenians and Spartans to prepare to meet the foe. But for Eleazar there was nothing behind him: this was the end.

On the question as to whether the defenders of Masada, as pious Jews, were permitted to commit suicide, there have been those who have looked upon the defenders as heroes, those who have looked upon them as cowards, and those who say that the defenders were really heroes, but that Josephus falsified the account of their death by presenting them as committing suicide, whereas as heroes they must have fought to the last man.

As to the suicide itself, there have been those who have argued that the defenders were permitted to kill themselves, according to the Talmudic law, which states that when one is required to commit incest (and adultery) and murder and to worship idols, one must rather kill oneself or let oneself be killed (Sanhedrin 74a). But this rule was not adopted until the time of the Bar Kochba rebellion (132–135) or the Hadrianic persecutions thereafter, and hence it is anachronistic to expect the defenders of Masada to abide by a rule which was not adopted until a half century later. Moreover, when the law was adopted, even in such a case as idolatry, there is a respected minority opinion, that of the great Rabbi Ishmael, prescribing that one should worship idols if by doing so one will save his life. Or we may say that the suicide was justified according to the sectarian law of the Sicarii. Again, the question has been raised as to which method of suicide was Halakhically least culpable and therefore most permissible, and, in particular, whether killing others in a suicide pact is permissible.

GOREN (3127) and KOLITZ (3128) argue that the defenders were acting in accordance with Jewish law in taking their own lives, citing the case of King Saul as a precedent for justified suicide when facing excruciating torture and certain death and when the enemy would bring about a desecration of G-d's name and glorify itself thereby. GOREN, who later became the Chief Ashkenazi Rabbi of Israel, goes so far as to permit Israel soldiers to commit suicide when they are captured by the enemy and feel that, under torture, they would be in danger of revealing military secrets. But RABINOWITZ (3129)(3130) says that the suicide was in accordance not with rabbinic Pharisaic law but with the law of the Sicarii that it is better to be killed than to transgress the injunction that the Jews be servants of no one other than G-d. RABINOWITZ (3131) presents another suggestion, that at the time of Masada the law with regard to suicide was still fluid and that by the standard at that time the suicide was justified. The suicide of Saul, says RABINOWITZ (3130), was different, since the consideration then was whether he would be able to stand up to the torture to which he might be subjected. The truth is that even in the case of Saul, we may remark, the rabbis struggle to justify his suicide, so that the thirteenth-century Ritba (Rabbi Yom Tov ben Abraham Ishbili) defended it on the ground that Saul feared that the enemy would force him to betray his faith, and the sixteenth-century Maharshal (Rabbi Solomon Luria) justified it on the ground that Saul had the status of G-d's anointed one and that his death at the hands of the enemy would be a desecration of G-d's name. FRIMER (3132) says that Saul's suicide was justified as a matter of national honor, since he would otherwise have died in a shameful and torturous manner at the hands of his opponents. By such standards, says FRIMER, the suicide at Masada would similarly be justified, since the fall of Masada would have been considered a national shame by its defenders. This is undoubtedly

true, since for them life under the sovereignty of anyone other than G-d was no life; but the rabbis nowhere justify suicide for such political or national reasons. The key point in the rabbinic defense of Saul's suicide is that it was the certainty of his death which justified his suicide. So stringent is the law in opposing suicide that even the mass suicides that occurred during the Middle Ages when Jews were given a choice of baptism or death and which were generally lauded as acts of sanctification of G-d's name were not without their critics.

APPLEBAUM (3133) and STERN (3134) note that these were not the only cases of suicide recorded by writers of this period. The Second Book of Maccabees (14. 37–46) mentions the suicide of Razis, who, when Seleucid soldiers came to put him under arrest, preferred to die by his own sword. Again, when Herod defeated a band of cave-dwelling brigands at Arbela in Galilee, one old man killed his seven children and wife and himself rather than surrender to Herod's troops (War 1. 312–313, Ant. 14. 429–430). The mutual mass suicide at Jotapata (War 3. 381–391), where Josephus' men preferred death to surrender, and the mass suicide at Gamala in Galilee, where, says Josephus (War 4. 79–81), more than five thousand, despairing of their lives, under attack by Vespasian, plunged headlong with their wives and children, so that only two women survived, are similar to the incident at Masada in that one might well question whether the suicide was justified. Josephus (War 6. 280), moreover, reports that at the time when the Temple was burned, two distinguished men, Meirus son of Belgas and Josephus son of Dalaeus, plunged into the flames rather than surrender to the Romans. Dio Cassius (66. 6. 3) similarly reports that some of the defenders of the Temple leaped into the flames, adding that others slew one another. If one were to use the standard of rabbinic law, none of these suicides, with the possible exception of those at Gamala, where we hear (War 4. 82) that the Romans in their rage spared not even infants, would be justified, since death was not certain. Hence Masada is part of a pattern of suicide that does not conform to the later Halakhah; and yet, neither the author of the Second Book of Maccabees in the case of Razis nor Josephus in the other cases (except Jotapata) condemns the suicides. It is true, as APPLEBAUM (3133) notes, that crucifixion or the arena was the fate of rebels against the Empire (Paulus, *Sententiae* 5. 23. 1) and was meted out to women as to men (Semaḥoth 2. 12), but such a fate was usually reserved only for the leaders of a revolt; thus, of those prisoners who marched in the triumphal procession of Vespasian and Titus in Rome only Simon bar Giora (War 7. 153–154) was executed. Again, when the Sicarii revolted in Cyrene, only their leader, Jonathan the weaver, was executed (War 7. 450).

In a popular but soundly reasoned article, GORDIS (3135) argues that Josephus' account of the suicide is not fabricated, and that we must guard against a bias in Josephus against the rebels but not, as here, in favor of them.

ZEITLIN (3136), pp. 191–203, in an article deeply critical of YADIN, concludes that the defenders of Masada were not heroic.

ROSENTHAL (3137) says that he cannot reach a conclusion as to whether to judge the fighters of Masada with praise or blame, since they did murder their wives and children.

ORLAN (3138)(3139), who speaks with deep reverence of Masada as one of the glorious chapters of Jewish history, accepts Josephus' account as true because we would not expect Josephus, who wished to glorify the Roman army, to present them as conquering an empty fortress and dead bodies. Inasmuch as there could not have been more than two hundred men of fighting age at Masada, one can hardly accuse so small a group of cowardice.

GORDIS (3140), answering ROSENTHAL (3137), regards the defenders of Masada as heroes. As to how pious men may engage in such a massacre of their wives and children, he cites the Massacre of St. Bartholemew's Day in 1572, the zeal displayed by pious extremists of both sides in the Thirty Years' War, the pious zeal of Oliver Cromwell, and the commandment in the Torah to wipe out the Amalekites. No one will ever dispute the zeal of religious extremists against others; but, we may ask, will they show similar zeal against themselves and their own families when the Law forbids suicide?

ZEITLIN (3141) argues that since the Sicarii believed in the immortality of the soul and in the concept that the body was the prison house of the soul, they justified suicide; but, in answer, one may note that Socrates, to whom Plato assigns similar views, opposed suicide (Phaedo 61 C–62 E).

HOENIG (3142) replies to ORLAN's (3138) attack on ZEITLIN, charging that ORLAN had resorted to secondary rather than to primary sources. In reply, ORLAN (3143) reaffirms his admiration for the valor of the defenders.

HOENIG (3144) says that the Sicarii at Masada had been led to take their own lives because they had adopted from the Stoics the justification of suicide and the stress on the immortality of the soul. But, we may reply, the fact that Josephus puts such views into the mouth of Eleazar ben Jair and expresses them in a way that might have been spoken by a Stoic would seem to be an illustration of Josephus' convention of using set speeches to present points of view which Josephus himself had clothed in language that would appeal to his Greek audience. In Josippon, however, the medieval Hebrew paraphrase of the 'War', as HOENIG himself notes, the defenders of Masada fight against the Roman camp, "dying for G-d and His sanctuary". This would seem to indicate an attempt to regard the defenders more favorably.

ORLAN (3145), in a rejoinder to ZEITLIN and HOENIG, particularly their charge that the Sicarii were cowards who did not fight the Romans, insists on the reliability of Josephus' account.

SPERO (3146) argues that the suicide of the defenders was not at variance with the teachings of the Talmud, that in fact their ardent love of liberty is itself a fundamental teaching of rabbinic Judaism, and that the Halakhah permits suicide when the individual has reason to believe that he will be tortured and shamed by the enemy. But, we may reply, if the ardent love of liberty is a rabbinic tenet, how can we explain the bitter opposition to the revolutionaries displayed in the Talmud (Giṭṭin 56a), where we read that the rabbis wished to make peace with the Romans but that the revolutionaries refused and even went so far as to burn the stores of grain so that a famine ensued?

HOENIG (3147), in a reply to RABINOWITZ (3131), SPERO (3146), KOLITZ (3128), and FRIMER (3132), argues that it is futile to speak of Masada in relation

to any Halakhah after 72 C.E. since one cannot deduce the halakhah of Masada from later rabbinic codes. He asks how we can be sure that the mikvah at Masada was built by Herod and similarly how we can know that the Sicarii used the *mikvaoth* simply because they were there.

HENGEL (3148) finds no evidence that the Sicarii at Masada stood close to the Pharisees in Halakhah. The fact that they had ritual baths and a synagogue must be balanced against the fact, as we have noted elsewhere, that the Sicarii had a different calendar, which is sufficient indication that they differed from the Pharisees in important ways.

FRIMER (3132) rightly draws a distinction in Halakhah between self-inflicted suicide and mutual suicide; even if one should decide that suicide is justified for himself, what right does this give to anyone to impose his decision upon others? When Saul had decided to die, though the Amalekite who put him to death had been told to do so by him, David, nevertheless, condemned the Amalekite to death and justly so, in the eyes of the rabbis. FRIMER concludes that the Jewish slaves who built the pathway to Masada were permitted by Jewish law to collaborate with the Romans in order to save their own lives.

3. If history does not show any example of armed Jews committing suicide, we must remember that the Sicarii were not ordinary Jews but a sectarian group with their own religious outlook and practices.

4. It is precisely the fortitude of the defenders and the nobility of their resolve to commit mutual suicide that the Romans admire in the Sicarii (War 7.405–406). In particular, the Romans admired the unwavering (ἀτρεπτος) contempt (καταφρόνησις) of death of the Sicarii; both of these words are familiar Stoic terms, as we see in Chrysippus, and may well have appeared in Josephus' source, which may thus have had a Stoic coloring, including the Stoic tenet of admiration for suicide.

5. Josephus nowhere intimates that he felt guilty about the suicide of his men at Jotapata. On the contrary, he makes it clear that this was not his but their idea. One might think that because Josephus (Life 12) compares the Pharisees, with whom he identified himself, to the Stoics, he was showing favor for the views of the latter, one of the most prominent of which was the justification and indeed the praise of suicide, as we see, for example, in Seneca (Epistulae 70), where he tells how a German in the beast-fighting barracks choked himself to death and how a gladiator broke his neck by putting it between the spokes of a moving cart, and concludes that "the dirtiest death is preferable to the daintiest slavery". But at Jotapata, in accordance with Jewish law, Josephus (War 3.369–377) argues that suicide is against the Torah. As KOLITZ (3128) and ALTER (3149) remark, if Josephus was trying to rid himself of a guilt feeling about not having committed suicide, psychologically we should expect that he would try to prove that no one else did it under similar circumstances. For those, such as WEISS-ROSMARIN, who are convinced that Josephus fabricated the story, we may suggest that he may have done so to cover up the brutality of the Romans who murdered the defenders, just as he may have covered up for Titus, who, according to Josephus (War 6.260–266), gave orders that the Temple be spared but who, according to Sulpicius Severus (Chronica 2.30), as noted



above, perhaps following a lost passage from Tacitus, ordered that it be burnt. Josephus nowhere justifies the mass suicide at Masada; it is the Romans who admire it (War 7. 406). But even if we impute such an attitude to Josephus himself, he thereby exposed his own action of surrender to obvious condemnation.

6. If Josephus' purpose in fabricating the story of the mass suicide was to build up the reputation of Flavius Silva, this purpose would have been better served by showing how fierce the Sicarii were in their fighting and how, despite this, he had conquered them. Moreover, WEISS-ROSMARIN does not explain how the Romans, who, after all, had marched several thousand men into Masada, could have been expected to believe the story of the suicide if it was merely an invention of Josephus.

7. The defender's aim was not merely to inflict loss upon the enemy; it was nothing less than liberty. This was at an end. In any case, their women and children would have been captured. The Romans had between six and ten thousand of the crack Tenth Legion to subdue the two or three hundred men at Masada. They had ten to fifteen thousand prisoners of war to bear supplies. Every day losses were inflicted upon the defenders. Moreover, they had to maintain a watch all around the mountain lest the Roman concentration at one point turn out to be a mere ruse. As to the possibility of escaping from Masada, Josephus does mention that certain of the Sicarii did succeed in fleeing to Egypt (War 7. 410), where six hundred of them were delivered over to the Romans by the Egyptian Jews. Though Josephus says that all of the Sicarii at Masada perished, one wonders whether some of them may not have made their way to Egypt.

8. Of the twenty-five skeletons discovered by YADIN only fourteen are those of males between the ages of twenty-two and sixty. If two women and five children (War 7. 399) managed to hide without being noticed, one can only guess that there were many others who did not escape. Moreover, we are dealing here with fanatics who would take the most extreme measures to protect their wives and children from capture. Or perhaps, as WIRGIN (3150) has suggested, there were indeed far fewer than 960 defenders at Masada, and hence we can more readily understand their despair and their readiness to commit suicide when they were about to be wiped out by such superior numbers. But if we view the matter thus, we are looking upon the defenders of Masada through our own rational eyes and we are forgetting that the defenders were actually fanatics. Moreover, if, indeed, there were only twenty-five or so defenders, one wonders how so small a group, even of the bravest fighters, could have kept the Romans at bay for four years after the fall of Jerusalem.

9. No doubt the Sicarii were pious, but in their own way, just as the Essenes and the Dead Sea sect(s) were extremely pious in their own sectarian way. The Essenes, for example, as we have noted above, according to Josephus (Ant. 18. 19), performed their sacrifices employing a different ritual of purification (or, according to another reading, did not send sacrifices to the Temple at all). Similarly, it is clear from YADIN's discovery that the Sicarii at Masada employed a solar calendar (unless this calendar belonged only to a few

individuals who took refuge there instead of to the Sicarii as a whole), so that they could not have observed the holidays when the Pharisaic Jews did. Hence the surprising fact that they made a raid on Ein-Gedi (War 4. 402) on Passover, despite the Torah's prohibition of such activities on this holiday, may be explained by suggesting that for the Sicarii this was not Passover. Yet it is astonishing that Josephus, who was so bitterly opposed to the Sicarii and who presumably would have looked for every possible charge to level against them (thus, for example, he says that his great opponent John of Gischala ate forbidden food), is silent about their calendar. But Josephus, as we have noted above, is, in general, not interested in matters of Jewish theology.

10. There is, of course, no way of knowing whose skeletons those are that were found at Masada. As to why only twenty-five of the 960 were found, archaeologists know that no dig, not even one as carefully organized as YADIN's, is complete; and it may well be that further digging will yield more skeletons. WIRGIN (3150), as noted above, suggests that Josephus exaggerated when he said that 960 perished at Masada. A small group expected to be wiped out would perhaps in their despair commit suicide, not 960. But, of course, this presupposes, as has been said above, that the defenders would act as rational men, whereas they were actually fanatics acting under very great emotional tension.

11. As to the great disarray of the corpses, this may indicate the great haste and excitement with which the Sicarii slew each other whenever they found their people. Or it may indicate a deliberate act of Roman disrespect. In any case, one cannot have expected the Romans to transport the bodies of their enemies and neatly pile them up in due reverence.

12. Inasmuch as there were ten men appointed to carry out the mass suicide, it was not that one man inspected 150 apartments, but rather that ten men each inspected fifteen apartments. As to the three skeletons in question, they were found not in a casement of the wall but in the lower terrace of the palace. The man was apparently a commander. Josephus says (War 7. 397) that the last man went with his family into the palace, set it ablaze, and killed his family and himself. These may be skeletons of that last man and his family. As to why these skeletons were not removed by the Romans, this may be because the whole building had collapsed. YADIN's excavators, indeed, found the skeletons under several yards of debris.

13. As to why some of the apartments were found burnt and others intact, this may be due to the fact that the defenders gathered in several rooms to be with their respective families and relatives in their last moments. Moreover, if the articles were found in greater disarray in some casement apartments than in others, this may be due to the lesser care that some of the volunteer excavators showed.

14. The Talmud (Yoma 37a), commenting on Leviticus 16. 8, "And Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats", says that the lots may be made of any material. "But is not that self-evident?" asks the Talmud. As to why eleven rather than ten lots were found, perhaps one of the lots was erroneously inscribed, or perhaps Ben Jair himself was not counted. Or perhaps Josephus

gave a round figure of ten, whereas the actual number was eleven. Or perhaps originally the names of all the men were written on potsherds, and ten were drawn from this number. If we keep looking, perhaps we may eventually discover the rest of the lots.

ZEITLIN (3150a) replies sharply to ORLAN's (3145) earlier reply to him.

GOLDSTEIN (3150b), p. 77, presents a cursory summary of the Halakhic point of view on the suicide at Masada, particularly the analogy with Saul's suicide.

TRIMBLE (3150c) comments on the behavior of the Jewish slaves, who, according to legend at least, built the ramp that brought the Romans to the top of the fortress wall. If, she says, they were certain that the Romans intended to kill the defenders, they should have suffered death rather than build it; but their own experience as Jews enslaved by the Romans can hardly have convinced them that the Romans intended to kill their defeated enemies. She concludes that, according to Jewish law, the death of the defenders of Masada was permitted (though not compulsory) in order to avoid the profanation of G-d's name. She correctly notes that Masada fell long before the rabbinic decision at Lydda restricted martyrdom to cases of idolatry, murder, and sexual immorality.

VIDAL-NAQUET (3150d) notes parallels and contrasts between the suicide speeches at Jotapata and at Masada.

HANKOFF (3150e) notes that Josephus' accounts of suicide incidents at Jotapata (War 3. 340–391), Scythopolis (War 2. 469–476), and Masada (War 7. 304–401) show a standardized plot.

## 25.20: The Date of the Capture of Masada

(3151) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Masada (in Hebrew). In: Bitzaron 58, 1968, pp. 71–78.

(3152) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Masada – a Chapter in the History of the Jews (in Hebrew). In: Bitzaron 59, 1968, pp. 51–60.

(3153) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: The Sicarii in Masada – Glory or Infamy? In: Tradition 11, 1970, pp. 5–30.

(3154) WERNER ECK: Die Eroberung von Masada und eine neue Inschrift des L. Flavius Silva Nonius Bassus. In: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 60, 1969, pp. 282–289.

(3155) WERNER ECK: Untersuchungen zu den Senatoren der Zeit von Vespasian bis Hadrian (Diss., Erlangen-Nürnberg 1968), pp. 79–94. Published (slightly revised) as: Senatoren von Vespasian bis Hadrian. Prosopographische Untersuchungen mit Einschluß der Jahres- und Provinzialfasten der Statthalter (Vestigia, 13). München 1970.

(3155a) GLEN W. BOWERSOCK: Old and New in the History of Judaea. In: Journal of Roman Studies 65, 1975, pp. 180–185.

ZEITLIN (3151)(3152) and HOENIG (3153) had insisted that Masada was captured in 72 rather than in 73 (this latter date had been merely inferred from Josephus, who gives no exact date), as usually stated by scholars; but it now appears, from two newly discovered inscriptions pertaining to the Roman general Flavius Silva and discussed by ECK (3154)(3155), that Silva could not

have gone to Judea before March, 73, and the storming of the fort could not have been begun before the spring of 74; hence the holding out of this fortress becomes even more remarkable.

BOWERSOCK (3155a) says that War 7. 219 and 252 clearly point to 73 as the date of the capture of Masada and notes that coins found at Masada terminate in 72/73. He explains the order of offices in the inscriptions cited by ECK (3154) (3155) as a matter of convenience. We may, however, comment that it was not the custom of the Romans in such inscriptions to be ambiguous.

### 25.21: Josephus and Archaeology: the Nabataeans

- (3156) JEAN STARCKY: The Nabataeans: a Historical Sketch. In: *Biblical Archeologist* 18, 1955, pp. 84–106.
- (3157) WILLY SCHOTTRUFF: Horonaim, Nimrim, Luhith und der Westrand des 'Landes Ataroth'. Ein Beitrag zur historischen Topographie des Landes Moab. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 82, 1966, pp. 163–208.
- (3157a) NELSON GLUECK: Deities and Dolphins. The Story of the Nabataeans. New York 1965.
- (3157b) MANFRED LINDNER: Die Könige von Petra. Aufstieg und Niedergang der Nabatäer im biblischen Edom. Ludwigsburg 1968.
- (3157c) JOSEPH D. AM(O)US(S)IN(E): A Qumran Commentary on Hosea (4Qp Hos<sup>b</sup>II). Historical Background and Date (in Russian). In: *Vestnik Drevnej Istorii* 3 (109), 1969, pp. 82–88.
- (3157d) PHILIP C. HAMMOND: The Nabataeans – Their History, Culture and Archaeology (*Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology*, 37). Gothenburg 1973.
- (3158) JOSEPH D. AMOUSSINE: *Observatiunculae qumraneae*. III. *Interprétation d'Osée* (4Q 166, Col. II). In: *Revue de Qumran* 7, 1971, pp. 545–552.
- (3158a) JOSEPH D. AMUSIN (AMOUSSINE): The Reflection of Historical Events of the First Century B.C. in Qumran Commentaries (4Q 161; 4Q 169; 4Q 166). In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 48, 1977, pp. 123–152.
- (3158b) JEAN STARCKY: Une inscription Nabatéenne de l'an 18 d'Arétas IV. In: *Hommages à André Dupont-Sommer*. Paris 1971. Pp. 151–159.
- (3158c) GEORGE ERNEST WRIGHT: Herod's Nabataean Neighbor. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 41, 1978, p. 123.

STARCKY (3156), noting that Josephus is our chief source for our scanty knowledge of the political history of the Nabataeans, co-ordinates his statements with the archaeological and numismatic finds in a first attempt to present a sketch of this history. He criticizes Josephus in only one detail, namely for failing to apply the title of king to Malichus (Malchus) II (40–70 C.E., War 3.68); we may comment that since he mentions Malchus in immediate juxtaposition with the kings Antiochus, Agrippa, and Soemus, he implies that Malchus was of equal status.

SCHOTTRUFF (3157), pp. 192–195, discusses Josephus' two lists of Nabataean sites in Moab (Ant. 13.397 and 14.18).

GLUECK (3157a) has a popular general survey co-ordinating the evidence of Josephus with that of archaeology.

LINDNER (3157b) presents a lavishly illustrated popular account largely dependent upon Josephus.

AM(O)US(S)IN(E) (3157c), according to the English summary, declares, on the basis of *Antiquities* 14. 1–2, that the Gentiles referred to in the Dead Sea commentary on Hosea are the troops of the Nabataean King Aretas, who, at the request of Hyrcanus II and jointly with him, had laid siege to Aristobulus II and to his followers, who had taken refuge in the Temple in Jerusalem. Since Josephus (*Ant.* 14. 28) connects the presence of the Nabataean troops in Jerusalem with the celebration of Passover and the beginning of famine in the land, there is reason to suppose that 4Qp Hos<sup>b</sup>II (= 4Q 166) and *Antiquities* 14. 1–2 refer to the same events. We may comment that the passage in the commentary on Hosea refers merely to the presence of strangers during a time of famine and of some great feast; to deduce such specific allusions as does AMOUSSINE from such a commonplace seems extravagant.

HAMMOND (3157d), who, in general, follows Josephus closely and at length, co-ordinates him with archaeological finds. He says that Josephus' reference to the extent of the Nabataean kingdom as lying between the Euphrates and the Dead Sea is refuted by the historical facts.

AMOUSSINE (3158) unconvincingly suggests that *Antiquities* 14. 14–21 enables us to identify the situation of the Dead Sea Commentary on Hosea; and he equates the strangers there with the Nabataeans of Aretas.

AMUSIN (AMOUSSINE) (3158a), commenting on the Dead Sea pesher on Hosea (4Q 166 = 4QpHos<sup>b</sup>II), identifies the "strangers" as the troops of the Nabataean king Aretas, who, together with Hyrcanus II (who was supported by the Pharisees), besieged Aristobulus and his allies (*Ant.* 14. 19–21). He concludes that the coincidence of a number of significant facts down to the smallest detail in Josephus' account and in the Dead Sea Commentary is so striking that it can hardly be accidental, and that hence the commentary on Hosea refers to a definite historical event, which can be dated as the fifteenth of Nisan, 65 B.C.E. The coincidence, we may suggest, is hardly as striking as AMUSIN would indicate.

STARCKY (3158b) concludes that Josephus, *Antiquities* 16. 294–295, refers to Aretas IV rather than to Aretas III.

WRIGHT (3158c) presents a very brief report on the excavation of a small Nabataean temple at Khirbet et-Tannur, not far from Petra, dating from the reign of Aretas IV, in 7 B.C.E., which is a good source of information on the art and religion of the Nabataeans.

## 25.22: Tiberias

(3158d) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Foundation of Tiberias (in Hebrew). In: HAIM Z. HIRSCHBERG, ed., *All the Land of Naphtali*. Jerusalem 1967. Pp. 163–169.

(3158e) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Tiberias in the Roman Period (in Hebrew). In: HAIM Z. HIRSCHBERG, ed., *All the Land of Naphtali*. Jerusalem 1967. Pp. 154–162.

(3158f) AVRAHAM NEGEV: Tiberias. In: RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton 1976. Pp. 920–921.

(3158g) WILLIAM M. CHRISTIE: *Palestine Calling*. London 1940.

AVI-YONAH (3158d) speculates on the factors, military and economic, that led Herod the Tetrarch to establish a city in Tiberias (Ant. 18.36). He conjectures that most of the inhabitants were Jews but that they were not of revolutionary bent even though Josephus describes them as a promiscuous rabble. On the basis of coins he dates the founding of the city some time between 17 and 22.

In an essay critical of Josephus, AVI-YONAH (3158e) traces the history of the status of the city. He establishes that the city was not autonomous in the full sense of the word until 44.

NEGEV (3158f) surveys the history of Tiberias in the light of the principal archaeological finds and Josephus.

CHRISTIE (3158g), pp. 45–50, has a brief, popular essay on Tiberias.

**25.23: Other Sites in Israel and Transjordan:** Akbara (Acchabaron), Alexandrion, Amathous, 'Arâq el-Emîr, Azekus (Azeka), Ascalon, Baniyas, Besara, Emmaus, Gader, Gamla (Gamala), Geba (Gibeah), Gilgal, Golan, Hyrcania, Jotapata, Machpelah, Mambre, Meiron, Petra, Ptolemais (Akko), Salem, Samaria, Sennabris, Sepphoris, Mount Sinai, Valley of the Cilicians.

(3159) CHARLES PICARD: Le félin écartelé de la fontaine d'Araq el Emir (Transjordanie). In: *Revue Archéologique* 1, 1965, pp. 91–94.

(3160) DOROTHY K. HILL: The Animal Fountain of 'Arâq el-Emîr. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 171, 1963, pp. 45–55.

(3160a) AVRAHAM NEGEV: Araq el-Emir. In: RICHARD STILLWELL, ed., *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*. Princeton 1976. Pp. 82–83.

(3160b) PAUL W. LAPP: The Second and Third Campaigns at 'Arâq el-Emîr. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 171, 1963, pp. 8–39.

(3160c) MENAHEM HARAN: *Temples and Temple-Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into the Character of Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. Oxford 1978.

(3160d) EDWARD F. CAMPBELL: Jewish Shrines of the Hellenistic and Persian Periods. In: FRANK M. CROSS, ed., *Symposia Celebrating the Seventh-Fifth Anniversary of the Founding of the American Schools of Oriental Research (1900–1975)*. Cambridge, Mass. 1979. Pp. 159–167.

(3161) ROBERT NORTH: Ap(h)eq(a) and 'Azeka. In: *Biblica* 41, 1960, pp. 41–63.

(3162) P. RUSSELL DIPLOCK: The Date of Askalon's Sculptured Panels and an Identification of the Caesarea Statues. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 103, 1971, pp. 13–16.

(3163) GUSTAV HÖLSCHER: Panias. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., *Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 18. 2, 1949, cols. 594–600.

(3164) JOSHUA BRAND: Gader (in Hebrew). In: *Erez-Israel* 8, 1967, pp. 280–282.

(3165) BOYCE M. BENNETT: The Search for Israelite Gilgal. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 104, 1972, pp. 111–122.

(3166) BERNDT SCHALLER. Iotapata. In: *Der Kleine Pauly* 2, Stuttgart 1967, p. 1444.

- (3167) ROLAND DE VAUX: Macpélah. In: Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément 5, Paris 1957, pp. 618–627.
- (3168) ANDREAS EVARISTUS MADER: Mambre. In: Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément 3, Paris 1938, pp. 344–350.
- (3169) ROLAND DE VAUX: Mambre. In: Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément 5, Paris 1952, pp. 753–758.
- (3170) JEAN STARCKY: Nouvelle épitaphe nabatéenne donnant le nom sémitique de Pétra. In: *Revue Biblique* 72, 1964, pp. 95–97.
- (3171) CAMERON MACKAY: Salem. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 80, 1948, pp. 121–130.
- (3172) HARTMUT GESE: Τὸ δὲ Ἀγὰρ Σινὰ ὄρος ἐστὶν ἐν τῇ Ἀραβίᾳ (Gal. 4, 25). In: *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 105, 1967, pp. 81–94 (= FRITZ MAASS, ed., *Festschrift Leonhard Rost*).
- (3173) JEAN-PAUL REY-COQUAIS: Notes de Géographie syrienne antique. In: *Mélanges de l'Université Saint-Joseph (Beyrouth)* 40, 1964, pp. 289–312.
- (3173a) ALBERT C. SUNDBERG: Josephus' Galilee Revisited: Akbara, Yodefat, Gamala. In: *Explor (Evanston, Illinois)* 3, 1977, pp. 44–54.
- (3173b) DAVID AMIT: Fortresses of the Desert in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). 2nd ed., Kefar Etzion 1976.
- (3173c) GÖTZ SCHMITT: Topographische Probleme bei Josephus. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 91, 1975, pp. 50–68.
- (3173d) WILLIAM M. CHRISTIE: *Palestine Calling*. London 1940.
- (3173e) BENJAMIN MAZAR (MAISLER): Beth She'arim: Report on the Excavations during 1936–1940. Vol. 1: Catacombs 1–4 (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1957. Trans. into English: New Brunswick, New Jersey 1973.
- (3173f) MOSHE SCHWABE and BARUCH LIFSHITZ: Beth She'arim. Vol. 2: The Greek Inscriptions (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1967. Trans. into English: New Brunswick, New Jersey 1974.
- (3173g) NAHMAN AVIGAD: Beth She'arim: Report on the Exvacations during 1953–1958. Vol. 3: Catacombs 12–23. New Brunswick, New Jersey 1976.
- (3173h) JACOB KAPLAN: 'I, Justus, Lie Here'. The Discovery of Beth Shearim. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 40, 1977, pp. 167–171.
- (3173i) PESSAH BAR-ADON: A Possible Fortified Synagogue at Beth Yerah. In: *Roman Frontier Studies*. Tel-Aviv 1971. P. 185.
- (3173j) BØRGE HJERL-HANSEN: *Emmaus*. Copenhagen 1947.
- (3173k) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: Gamla in Gaulanitis. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 92, 1976, pp. 54–71.
- (3173l) KONRAD FURRER: Taricheae und Gamala. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 12, 1889, pp. 148–151.
- (3173m) ERIC M. MEYERS, JAMES F. STRANGE, and DENNIS E. GROH: The Meiron Excavation Project: Archeological Survey in Galilee and Golan, 1976. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 230, 1978, pp. 1–24.
- (3173n) HERSHEL SHANKS: Gamla: The Masada of the North. In: *Biblical Archaeology Review* 5, Jan.–Febr. 1979, pp. 12–19.
- (3173o) ANSON F. RAINEY: The Identification of Philistine Gath: A Problem in Source Analysis for Historical Geography. In: *Erez-Israel (English section)* 12, 1975, pp. 63–76.
- (3173p) J. MAXWELL MILLER: Geba/Gibeah of Benjamin. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 25, 1975, pp. 145–166.
- (3173q) CAROL L. and ERIC M. MEYERS and JAMES F. STRANGE: Excavations at Meiron, in upper Galilee – 1971, 1972. A preliminary report. In: *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 214, 1974, pp. 2–25.
- (3173r) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: Two Notes on the Jordan Valley. In: *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society* 17, 1937, pp. 252–254.

- (3173s) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: Hellenistic Cities of Judaea and Its Vicinity – Some New Aspects. In: B. LEVICK, ed.: *The Ancient Historian and His Materials: Essays in honour of C. E. Stevens on his seventieth birthday*. London 1975. Pp. 59–73.
- (3173t) SHIMON APPLEBAUM, SHIMON DOR, and ZEEV SAFRAI: The Towers of Samaria. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 110, 1978, pp. 91–100.
- (3173u) FRANCIS W. BOELTER: Sepphoris – Seat of the Galilean Sanhedrin. In: *Explor* 3, 1977, pp. 36–43.
- (3173v) STANISLAO LOFFREDA: Una tomba romana al Monte Tabor. In: *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 28, 1978, pp. 241–246.
- (3173w) FRÉDÉRIC MANNS: Magdala dans les sources littéraires. In: *Studia Hierosolymitana in Onore del P. Bellarmino Bagatti*. Vol. 1 (*Studium Biblicum Franciscanum*, 22). Jerusalem 1976. Pp. 307–337.

PICARD (3159) remarks that Josephus, *Antiquities* 12. 230–231, enables us to date the system of irrigation in Transjordan which forms part of the fountain of 'Arâq el-Emîr studied by HILL (3160), noted above in our discussion of the Tobiads, as the work of Hyrcanus the Tobiad, who died at the time of the accession of Antiochus Epiphanes of Syria in 175 B.C.E., a fact which will explain its incompleteness.

NEGEV (3160a) summarizes the chief archaeological discoveries at 'Arâq el-Emîr in the light of Josephus.

LAPP (3160b) suggests that the palace Qaşr el-'Abd near 'Arâq el-Emîr in Transjordan was a Jewish temple; but, says HARAN (3160c), such a view does not fit in with the historical circumstances of that time, since, unlike Leontopolis, which was some distance away from Jerusalem, 'Arâq el-Emîr was not.

CAMPBELL (3160d), pp. 162–164, however, adopts LAPP's view that the Qaşr building at 'Arâq el-Emîr is a temple, which, indeed, Josephus (*Ant.* 12. 230) calls a fortress.

NORTH (3161) comments on the site near Bethlehem called Azekus and Azaka by Josephus (*Ant.* 6. 170 and 8.246).

DIPLOCK (3162) concludes that the excavations at Ascalon between 1920 and 1924 confirm Josephus' description of the peristyle building (*War* 1. 422).

HÖLSCHER (3163) presents a history of Pnias (Banias) in the Golan heights in the light of archaeology, inscriptions, and coins, but he is uncritical of Josephus, though he has particular comments on *War* 2. 95, *Antiquities* 15. 344 and *Antiquities* 18. 28.

BRAND (3164) asserts that Gader (*Rosh Hashanah* 22a) is not Umm Qeis in Jerusalem but Gezer (= Gazara).

BENNETT (3165), pp. 118–120, discussing the location of Israelite Gilgal, says that Josephus is not always correct in the distances that he gives between specific sites, but he is also perfectly right when he says that Josephus is unfairly sometimes said to be mistaken because of a misunderstanding as to the method of his measurement. He concludes that Suwwānat eth-Thaniya, which fits the measurements given by Josephus, is the most likely site of Gilgal.

SCHALLER (3166) has a brief survey, based primarily on Josephus, of Jotapata, the city where Josephus made his final defense in Galilee.



DE VAUX (3167) has a survey of the archaeology of the site of Machpelah near Hebron. He notes that the tombs which are described in War 4. 532 as of exquisite workmanship are Herodian in magnificence and style.

MADER (3168) has a good summary of excavations at Mambre.

DE VAUX (3169) gives a good summary of the literary and archaeological evidence about the site. In particular, he recounts the history of the great tree which Josephus mentions as being there (War 4. 544, Ant. 1. 186).

STARCKY (3170) comments on a Nabatean inscription of Petra, which contains the first epigraphic mention of the Semitic name of the city, Reqem. This confirms Josephus (Ant. 4. 161), who says that *Ῥεκῆμη* is the Petra of the Greeks.

MACKAY (3171) accepts the Septuagint's version, which puts Salem in the vicinity of Shechem, and rejects that of Josephus (War 6. 438 and Ant. 1. 180), who identifies it with Jerusalem, on the ground that the latter was here guilty of anti-Samaritan bias; but, we may comment, the fact that rabbinic tradition is unanimous (e.g., Genesis Rabbah 56. 10) in identifying Melchizedek's Salem (Genesis 14. 18) as Jerusalem confirms Josephus.

GESE (3172) contends that Josephus, who is usually cited as the chief witness for the view that Mount Sinai is located in the Sinai peninsula, is not clear on the point. He argues that Galatians 4. 25 indicates that Hagar, which is equated with Hegra, according to Jewish place-legends, is Mount Sinai in Arabia, east of the Gulf of Akaba.

REY-COQUAIS (3173) identifies the Valley of the Cilicians (Ant. 13. 395–397) as the royal valley mentioned by Strabo (16. 2. 16), which is in the upper Jordan River near its source.

SUNDBERG (3173a) notes that at Akbara (Acchabaron), which Josephus (War 2. 573) says he fortified, the Meiron Excavation Project found not a single potsherd or a single chip of hand-worked stone; hence he concludes that Josephus' fort seems to have been a product of his imagination. We may comment, however, that the expedition made an extremely cursory, unscientific, and far from complete survey.

AMIT (3173b), pp. 13–20, presents unannotated selections from Josephus concerning Alexandrion.

SCHMITT (3173c) identifies Amathous (War 1. 86 and Ant. 13. 356) with Betharamata (War 2. 59 and Ant. 17. 277), which, he suggests, is Tell 'Ammātā. He suggests that the area of Betharamatha and Abila belonged to the Synedrion of Jericho.

CHRISTIE (3173d), pp. 59–64, has an essay on whether there were two Bethsaidas or only one.

MAZAR (MAISLER) (3173e), pp. 3–4, notes that from Josephus (Life 115–119) we learn that Besara (Beth She'arim) was a Jewish settlement, whereas nearby Gaba was a Gentile city. He conjectures that initially it was probably part of the extensive Hasmonean holdings, whereas later it fell into the hands of Herod. He is convinced, pp. 7–9, that Shêkh Abrêq (Sheikh Abreik) is the present site of Beth She'arim. From Josephus' geographical description (Ant. 15. 294), as confirmed by the Talmud, we can, moreover, pinpoint Gaba's location.

SCHWABE and LIFSHITZ (3173f) present a description of the inscriptions found at Beth She'arim, together with the text, translation, commentary, and bibliography.

AVIGAD (3173g) describes the menorah and other religious objects from the Roman period found at Beth She'arim.

KAPLAN (3173h) says the proof that Sheikk Abreik is Besara (Life 115–119) and Beth Shearim, a well-known burial place according to rabbinic sources, is the Greek epitaph commemorating Justus discovered in Catacomb 11.

BAR-ADON (3173i) identifies Beth Yerah with Sinnabris (War 3. 447).

I have not seen HJERL-HANSEN (3173j) on Emmaus.

BAR-KOCHVA (3173k), through analysis of the topography, geography, and administrative information, supports the suggestion of FURRER (3173l) identifying Gamla (Gamala in Josephus) with the spur of Tell ed Drā', twenty kilometers east of Lake Tiberias. He opposes the identification of Gamla with Ḥirbet es-Salām on the basis of Josephus' description (War 4. 2–8). He says that Ḥirbet es-Salām was, however, certainly a Jewish fortress which participated in the war against the Romans. He identifies it with Kefar Solyme, mentioned by Josephus (Life 187) as one of the settlements which revolted against Agrippa II. He asserts that the special features of the site may contribute to an understanding of the military manoeuvres and give a new dimension to Josephus' narrative of the three attempts made by the Romans to occupy the city. He concludes that Josephus is relatively accurate in describing the location of buildings; but his topographical descriptions, though precise, especially when it came to discussing sites that he had fortified, are unusually incomplete, and Josephus tends to exaggerate the measurements of height.

SUNDBERG (3173a) remarks that a visit of the Meiron Excavation Project to Gamala (Gamla) closely confirms Josephus' description, particularly on the basis of potsherds.

MEYERS, STRANGE, and GROH (3173m) report the discovery of pottery reflecting the occupation of Gamla in the late Hellenistic and early Roman periods, thus directly confirming Josephus' account (War 4. 4–83).

SHANKS (3173n) reports on the excavations of SCHMARYAHU GUTTMAN, who believes that he has found the place where the Romans breached the wall at Gamla. He notes that because Gamla was destroyed early in the war, none of the coins minted by the Jewish revolutionaries have been found there.

RAINEY (3173o), commenting on Antiquities 5. 87, 9. 217, and 9. 275, asserts that though the Biblical passage does not even mention Gath and probably reflects a Judean expansion only in southern Philistia, Josephus took it to mean the conquest of Philistia from south to north. Josephus knew of a Gath only in northern Philistia.

MILLER (3173p) identifies Geba (Gibeah, not to be confused with Gaba) with present-day Jeba. He says that the evidence of Josephus, which places Gibeah in the vicinity of Jerusalem, is based on inferences from Judges 19–21 and is probably misleading. But even if correct, the narrative can still be best understood if we presuppose a single Benjaminite Geba (Gibeah) at present-day Jeba.

AMIT (3173b), pp. 30–35, has unannotated selections from Josephus concerning Hyrcania.

SUNDBERG (3173a) says that a superficial examination of Jotapata by the Meiron Excavations Project corroborates Josephus' description of the hill, the cave, the defense wall, and the Roman ramp.

MEYERS, STRANGE, and GROH (3173m), commenting on Josephus' statement that he built a wall around the city of Jotapata (War 3. 159), remark, in view of their preliminary archaeological survey, that it is possible that the wall did not actually encompass the city, since Josephus himself relates (War 3. 158) that the city is accessible from the north side alone.

MEYERS and STRANGE (3173q) conclude that Meiron is the Meroth or Ameroth of Josephus (War 2. 573, 3. 40; Ant. 5. 63; Life 188). The question, however, whether or not Josephus or anyone else fortified Meiron during the First Revolt cannot be answered on the basis of these soundings.

AVI-YONAH (3173r) suggests that Papyron is on the Jerusalem-Amman road near the Jordan and was so called from the fact that the papyrus plant grows here in abundance due to the marshy ground. Such a location in the plain south-east of Jericho accords well with Josephus (War 1. 130, Ant. 14. 33).

APPLEBAUM (3173s) notes that the excavations at Ptolemais-Akko (Ant. 13. 324ff.) have revealed something of the havoc wrought as a result of its capture by Cleopatra. He suggests that a special factor here may have been that the Jewish troops of Cleopatra, under the leadership of their Jewish commander-in-chief Ananias, may have been particularly destructive of the shrine of Zeus Soter.

APPLEBAUM, DOR, and SAFRAI (3173t) report on the discovery of towers, which might well have originated as a Jewish defensive device before 145 B.C.E. In 129 Simon's successor, John Hyrcanus, took the offensive (Ant. 13. 255–256, 280) and laid siege to Samaria because its people had attacked the Marisenoï, who had settled there and had been Jewish allies. The most reasonable interpretation of Josephus (Ant. 13. 275) which is not in disagreement with the pottery found around the towers is that these settlers had been planted by the Hasmoneans to encircle Samaria some time before the last decade of the second century B.C.E.

BOELTER (3173u), while noting the scantiness of archaeological evidence, concludes that Sepphoris joined the Romans against Josephus in the Jewish War, but more likely because of the vulnerability of its water supply to siege tactics than because of any deep commitment to peace.

LOFFREDA (3173v) reports on the discovery in 1978 of an artificial cave on Mount Tabor, the pottery of which indicates a date between the two Jewish wars (70–135); he adds that there may be some link between the tombs found there and the defeat of the defending garrison by Placidus (War 4. 54–61) through a ruse.

MANNS (3173w) co-ordinates Josephus with the Talmudic and pagan sources in discussing the history of Tarichaeae, which he identifies with Magdala.

## 25.24: Sites in Lebanon and in Syria

- (3174) JEAN LAUFFRAY: Forums et monuments de Béryte. In: *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth* 7, 1944–45, pp. 13–80.
- (3175) EDMOND FRÉZOULS: Recherches sur les théâtres de l'orient syrien. In: *Syria* 36, 1959, pp. 202–227.
- (3176) DOMINIQUE SOURDEL: Les cultes du Hauran à l'époque romaine (*Institut Français d'Archéologie de Beyrouth, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique*, 53). Paris 1952.
- (3176a) URIEL RAPPAPORT: Les Iduméens en Egypte. In: *Revue de Philologie* 43, 1969, pp. 73–82.
- (3176b) C. F. ZUCKER: Doppelinschrift spätptolemäischer Zeit aus der Garnison von Hermopolis Magan, In: *Abh. Pr. Ak. Phil.-hist.* 1937, no. 6.
- (3176c) S. THOMAS PARKER: The Decapolis Reviewed. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, 1975, pp. 437–441.
- (3176d) HANS BIETENHARD: Die syrische Dekapolis von Pompeius bis Traian. In: WOLFGANG HAASE and HILDEGARD TEMPORINI, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.8, 1977, pp. 220–261 (= revised and enlarged version of his: *Die Dekapolis von Pompeius bis Trajan*. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 79, 1963, pp. 24–58).
- (3176e) RICHARD D. SULLIVAN: The Dynasty of Emesa. In: WOLFGANG HAASE and HILDEGARD TEMPORINI, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* 2.8, 1977, pp. 198–219.
- (3176f) SHIMON DOR: Inscriptions from the Period of the House of Herod – in Bashan, Trachon(itis), and Hauran (in Hebrew). In: SHIMON APPLEBAUM, ed., *The Hermon and Its Foothills*. Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 42–48 (reprinted from *Teva' ve-'arez*, 16, 1974, pp. 304–309).
- (3176g) FRIEDRICH GUSTAV LANG: 'Über Sidon mitten ins Gebiet der Dekapolis'. *Geographie und Theologie in Markus* 7, 13. In: *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 94, 1978, pp. 145–160.

LAUFFRAY (3174), pp. 35–57, in his full and careful report of Roman civic works excavated in Beirut, comments particularly on the remains of a large civic basilica which he thinks, from the fact of its proximity to a forum, was part of the forum dedicated by Agrippa I and Berenice. We may comment that if, indeed, it is a building erected by Agrippa I we should expect it to be one of the four types of buildings singled out by Josephus (*Ant.* 19. 335) as being particularly large and beautiful which Agrippa built there, namely a theatre, an amphitheatre, baths, and porticoes.

FRÉZOULS (3175) gives an inventory of ancient theatres in Syria, including several mentioned by Josephus, and comments particularly on the most ancient theatre, namely Herod the Great's.

SOURDEL (3176), pp. 4–8, 117–118, in his historical survey of Hauran in Syria, which is based largely on archaeological finds, cites Josephus uncritically.

RAPPAPORT (3176a), in a critique of ZUCKER (3176b), concludes, on the basis of Josephus (*Ant.* 13. 395), that Apollonia was a Phoenician city, like the other coastal cities, completely distinct from Idumaea.

PARKER (3176c), objecting to the view that the Decapolis was a league, asserts that it is merely a geographical term. We may, however, ask why, if merely geographical, the list varies, as Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* 5. 74) admits. There is no hint that in 66–70 the Decapolis united against their common enemy, the Jews. We

may conclude that because the cities were very widely spread out they must have constituted a political league rather than a geographical entity.

BIETENHARD (3176d) surveys the cities of the Decapolis, their location and area, and their history in connection with Pompey and the Herodians and the Jewish War of 66–70.

SULLIVAN (3176e) constantly co-ordinates Josephus with inscriptions and coins in presenting the history of the city of Emesa in Syria. He notes that the dynasts in the first century, who married into the family of Herod, assumed a relatively large burden in international maneuvering between Rome and Parthia, hence its importance to Josephus.

On the basis of Josephus especially, DOR (3176f) briefly traces the history of the region of Bashon, Trachon(itis), and Hauran, noting, in particular, the numerous settlements established by Herod. He concludes that Josephus' account is corroborated by archaeological remains, especially inscriptions of Agrippa I and II, and particularly as to the boundaries of Jewish rule.

LANG (3176g) comments on the boundaries, historically considered, of Tyre (Ant. 8. 153ff.) and of the Decapolis (War 3. 446), and, in particular, discusses whether the latter included Damascus.

## 25.25: Josephus and Numismatic Evidence (see also 16.2 and 16.3)

- (3177) LEO A. MAYER: *A Bibliography of Jewish Numismatics*, ed. by MICHAEL AVI-YONAH. Jerusalem 1966.
- (3178) BARUCH KANAEL: *Literaturüberblicke der griechischen Numismatik – Altjüdische Münzen*. In: *Jahrbuch für Numismatik und Geldgeschichte* 17, 1967, pp. 159–298.
- (3179) FREDERIC W. MADDEN: *History of Jewish Coinage and of Money in the Old and New Testament*. London 1864; rpt. New York 1967.
- (3180) ADOLF REIFENBERG: *Ancient Jewish Coins*. Jerusalem 1940, 1947, 1965.
- (3181) HENRY ST. J. HART: *Judaea and Rome: the Official Commentary*. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 3, 1952, pp. 172–198.
- (3182) JOSEF MEYSHAN: *Jewish Coins in Ancient Historiography. The Importance of Numismatics for the History of Israel*. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 96, 1964, pp. 46–52.
- (3183) YA'AKOV MESHORER: *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1966. Trans. into English by I. H. LEVINE: Tel-Aviv 1967.
- (3184) JOSEF MEYSHAN: *Essays in Jewish Numismatics*. Jerusalem 1968.
- (3185) WOLF WIRGIN and SIEGFRIED MANDEL: *The History of Coins and Symbols in Ancient Israel*. New York 1958.
- (3186) ARYE BEN-DAVID: *Jerusalem und Tyros. Ein Beitrag zur palästinensischen Münz- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte (126 a. C. – 57 p. C.)* (Kleine Schriften zur Wirtschaftsgeschichte, 1). Basel 1969.
- (3187) JOSEPH NAVEH: *Dated Coins of Alexander Jannaeus*. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 18, 1968, pp. 20–26.
- (3188) ETHELBERG STAUFFER: *Zur Münzprägung und Judenpolitik des Pontius Pilatus*. In: *La Nouvelle Clio* 1–2, 1949–50, pp. 495–514.
- (3189) ADOLF REIFENBERG: *A Memorial Coin of Herod Agrippa I* (in Hebrew). In: *Yedi'ot Ha-hevrah ha-ivrit le-ḥakirat Erez-Yisrael ve-atikoteha* 5, 1937–38, pp. 117–118.

- (3190) SHELDON A. NODELMAN: A Preliminary History of Characene. In: *Berytus* 13, 1959–60, pp. 83–121.
- (3191) B. SIMONETTA: Note di numismatica partica. *Vonone II, Vologese I e Vardane II*. In: *Rivista Italiana di Numismatica* 60, 1958, pp. 3–10.
- (3192) HENRI SEYRIG: Sur quelques ères syriennes. In: *Revue numismatique* 6. Ser., vol 6, 1964, pp. 51–67.
- (3192a) RAMON SUGRANYES DE FRANCH: Études sur le droit palestinien à l'époque évangélique. *La contrainte par corps*. Fribourg 1946.
- (3192b) ARYE BEN-DAVID: The Standard of the Sheqel. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 98, 1966, pp. 168–169.
- (3192c) URIEL RAPPAPORT: The Emergence of Hasmonean Coinage. In: *Association for Jewish Studies Review* 1, 1976, pp. 171–186.
- (3192d) A(LBERT) A. BELL: The Coins of the Procurators. In: *Judaica Post* 5, 1977, pp. 450–452.
- (3192e) BARUCH KANAEL: Ancient Jewish Coins and Their Historical Importance. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 26, 1963, pp. 38–62.
- (3192f) DAVID HENDIN: *Guide to Ancient Jewish Coins*. With Values by HERBERT KREINDLER. New York 1976.

MAYER (3177) presents an unannotated bibliography of 822 items, many of them, to judge from the index, dealing with the Maccabean and Herodian periods.

KANAEL (3178) presents a very thorough, helpful, annotated, systematic, and analytical bibliography. There are two preliminary chapters containing a short survey of the history of research in Jewish numismatics followed by a longer discussion of the present status of the major problems in this field. The main part of the article consists of a summary of 381 articles and books so far as they pertain to coins, with occasional critical remarks and with a number of cross-references to Josephus.

MADDEN (3179), a landmark in the field, has been reprinted with a prolegomenon by AVI-YONAH discussing MADDEN's contribution to the study and the enduring significance of this volume, but also noting MADDEN's errors. In particular, AVI-YONAH carps at MADDEN for his generally uncritical acceptance of the authority of Josephus, for example with regard to the story of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem (p. 22), and for misinterpreting the name of Eleazar on coins (p. 161).

REIFENBERG (3180), in a deservedly well-known work, notes that although Josephus nowhere comments on coins as such, he is a most important source for the identification and chronological arrangement of coins. The coins, in truth, support Josephus' version of the life of Agrippa I.

HART (3181), who advocates the use of coins as vehicles of official commentary (with, we may remark, the limitations of such) for the history of Judaea from the first century B.C.E. until after the Bar Kochba rebellion, presents a survey of the coins, noting their importance as a warning not to revolt against Rome. He compares Josephus' account of the triumphal procession of Vespasian and Titus in 71 (War 7. 148–150) with the numismatic evidence.

MEYSHAN (3182), describing coins struck from the period of the Hasmoneans to the revolt of Bar Kochba, notes that they confirm Josephus' reports about Herod and his sons, particularly in indicating that he began to reign in the

third year after the Roman Senate had bestowed upon him the title of king in 40 B.C.E. In other places the coins correct and expand his account, especially in chronology. He notes the importance of the fact that the Jewish coins which were struck during the great revolt of 66–74 provide contemporary representations of the chief vessels used in the Temple ritual.

MESHORER (3183), in a general work marked by independent judgment which does not pretend to be a complete corpus, covers the coins from the Persian period through Bar Kochba.

In his collected essays MEYSHAN (3184) deals, in particular (pp. 55–134), with the Herodian dynasty and (pp. 135–150) with the first and second revolts against Rome, refuting WIRGIN and MANDEL (3185), largely on the basis of Josephus.

BEN-DAVID (3186) discusses Josephus' evidence, without commenting on his reliability, for the influx of Tyrian shekels to Palestine, and compares his account with information derived from the Bible, the Talmud, and archaeology.

NAVEH (3187), commenting on coins struck by Alexander Jannaeus in 83 and 78 B.C.E. in Aramaic, suggests that this is an attempt by Jannaeus to speak to the people in their own language and thus to appease them toward the end of his reign. Josephus (War 1. 105–106, Ant. 13. 393–404) says that the Jews welcomed Jannaeus eagerly after his successful three-year campaign in Transjordan. But these coins show that he had earlier attempted to appease them; and it is unlikely that the people would have welcomed him, in view of their oppression at his hands, merely because of his successes on the battlefield.

STAUFFER (3188) notes that the coins confirm the statements in Philo and Josephus that Pilate was strongly anti-Jewish. In particular, he says, the *lituus*, the curved trumpet, on his coins is a symbol of the Roman ruler mentality, a distinct provocation to the Jews coinciding with Sejanus' plan for a 'final solution' to the Jewish problem; but we may comment that the masses of the Jews, who are commanded to pray for the welfare of the government, hardly objected to a symbol of authority; and the fact that the *lituus* did not contain an image of the emperor would find favor in their eyes.

REIFENBERG (3189) discusses a coin depicting Agrippa I naked, as was customary with prisoners, being crowned in the presence of the Emperor. It is not unlikely that the object hanging down from the pediment is the golden chain presented to the king according to Josephus (Ant. 19. 294).

NODELMAN (3190), pp. 97–100, comments on King Abennerigus (Ant. 20. 22), to whom Izates was entrusted for his safety by Monobazus king of Adiabene. He prefers Josephus' spelling, Abennerigus, to that presented on a coin, Abinerglos, which has other obvious errors, but concludes that his name was probably Abinergaos. He then reconstructs the historical circumstances of his reign, which he dates, partly on the basis of numismatic evidence, from 30 to 36 C.E.

SIMONETTA (3191) uses numismatic evidence in dating the reigns of the Parthian kings Vonones II (December 51; cf. Tacitus, Annals 12. 14, omitted by Josephus) and Vologeses (51–80, Ant. 20. 74) and in determining the blood relationships among them.

SEYRIG (3192), pp. 55–56, co-ordinates the evidence of Josephus and of the coins with regard to the successors of Agrippa II. He asks how Josephus, whose 'Antiquities' is dated in 94, could have referred to the mistreatment of the Jews by the Romans, who succeeded to the authority of Agrippa II, if the province was not annexed until 93 at the earliest, as an inscription shows; and he answers that perhaps there was only a partial annexation, or that the passage in Josephus belongs to a second edition.

SUGRANYES DE FRANCH (3192a), p. 139, comments on the Hasmonean and Herodian coinage (War 1. 451, 458; Ant. 15. 294, 17. 23), which was intended to give a Greek façade to their reigns.

BEN-DAVID (3192b) comments that Josephus' statement (Ant. 3. 194) that the shekel was equivalent to four Attic drachmas is incorrect, since the Mishnah's statement (Berakhoth 8. 7) that a sela is equal to a Tyrian shekel is confirmed by archaeological excavations and since the shekel is equal to six Tyrian drachmas of a Phoenician standard.

RAPPAPORT (3192c) contends that the Hasmonean coinage did not form a step in the march of Judea towards sovereignty, since if the coinage had had such a purpose we should expect it to be of silver. In addition, the coins do not bear any portraits of the rulers so common on other contemporary coins; but, we may remark, this may be because of the rulers' sensitivity to the Jewish law prohibiting such likenesses in three dimensions.

I have not seen BELL (3192d). [See *infra*, p. 967.]

KANAEL (3192e) presents a brief survey of the coins from the Biblical period through Bar Kochba, and is especially interested in Herod's attempt to join heathen and Jewish themes in them.

HENDIN (3192f) constantly cites Josephus in his popular introduction to the subject.



## 26: Vocabulary and Style

### 26.0: Dictionaries and Concordances to Josephus

- (3193) KARL H. RENGSTORF, ed.: *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*. Vol. 1: A–Δ. Leiden 1973. Vol. 2: E–K. Leiden 1975. Vol. 3: Λ–Π. Leiden 1979.
- (3194) JOHANN B. OTT: *Thesaurus Flavianus*. 7 vols. Unpublished. In: Zentralbibliothek, Zürich (Ms C 233–239).
- (3195) GERHARD DELLING and NIKOLAUS WALTER: *Zur Josephus-Forschung um 1700* (John. Bapt. Otts *Thesaurus Flavianus*). In: *Klio* 38, 1960, pp. 233–266.
- (3196) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS: *A Lexicon to Josephus*. 4 fascicles (through ἐμφιλοχῶρεῖν). Paris 1930–1955.
- (3197) BENEDICTUS NIESE, ed. *Flavii Josephi Opera*. Vol. 7: Index. Berlin 1895.
- (3198) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: *Josephus*, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965.
- (3199) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*. In: KARL H. RENGSTORF, ed., *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*, Supplement 1. Leiden 1968.
- (3200) GÜNTHER ZUNTZ, rev.: HENRY ST. J. THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS, *A Lexicon to Josephus*. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2, 1957, pp. 380–387. [See *infra*, p. 967.]

Compared to the world of scholarship, with its chaotic, disorganized premium on individual initiative, the world of business in a system of free enterprise is almost rigidly totalitarian. A good – and very sad – example is the making of concordances. RENGSTORF's (3193) is the fourth concordance or dictionary devoted to Josephus. In the eighteenth century OTT (3194) compiled a very incomplete and selective "*Thesaurus Flavianus*" in seven handwritten volumes, still in manuscript, described by DELLING and WALTER (3195). It is concerned primarily with explaining the New Testament through linguistic parallels from Josephus and with noting characteristically Josephan vocabulary rather than with being exhaustive. It is of some value for the part of the alphabet not yet reached by THACKERAY and MARCUS (3196) and RENGSTORF but of limited worth, as seen from the fact that for the letters covered by THACKERAY – MARCUS it has less than half as many words listed, and that for the proper names included in NIESE's (3197) index and in my (3198) Loeb volume, as well as in SCHALIT's (3199) index, it has approximately one third as many entries.

ADOLF SCHLATTER, who died in 1938, compiled for his personal use, perhaps with the aid of OTT, but did not publish, a practically complete dictionary to Josephus directed toward understanding the vocabulary of Josephus the historian and toward seeing parallels in the Gospels. He ultimately incorporated much of this material into his commentaries on the Gospels. The manuscript is now in the hands of RENGSTORF.

THACKERAY and MARCUS (3196) published four fascicles of their dictionary, originally compiled by THACKERAY for his private use, reaching as far as ἐμπιλοχωρεῖν. ZUNTZ (3200) has an important review and appreciation. Since MARCUS' death in 1956 it has been in the hands of HORST R. MOEHRING at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, where apparently nothing will be done with it.

In the meantime, a fifth concordance has been announced, to be published by Biblical Research Associates at the College of Wooster, Ohio. Unlike all previous concordances, including RENGSTORF, which has been done by hand, the Wooster project is to be a computer-generated key-word-in-context concordance, with each word arranged in context directly above every other use of that word so that contextual patterns tend to stand out, thus making it more useful for various kinds of syntactical and morphological research. The goal of the Wooster project is to produce various types of analytical concordances: according to content, morphology, syntax, style, language and semantics.

RENGSTORF's (3193) concordance had been in the making for more than two decades. It is intended to prepare the way for dictionaries of Hellenistic Greek and of Judaic Greek. Others may discuss the almost moral question whether any work intended as to tool for scholars should have a price tag which virtually puts it out of reach of all but a handful, unless they be fortunate enough to be reviewers. That we are truly grateful for such a work is axiomatic, for it has numerous virtues. It lists occurrences in the order in which Josephus composed his works; THACKERAY – MARCUS unfortunately lists the 'Antiquities' before the 'War', which was written almost two decades earlier. Its level of accuracy, except in the English introduction, where there are seven misprints in eight pages, is high. It lists noteworthy variant readings found in the four major modern editions of Josephus, the *editio maior* and *editio minor* of NIESE, NABER, and THACKERAY – MARCUS – WIKGREN – FELDMAN's Loeb edition, but it unfortunately omits the meanings of words which are alternative readings or which are emendations that have not been accepted by most editors. Whereas THACKERAY – MARCUS is exhaustive in most cases but is content to list merely a selection of occurrences for certain words (sometimes, strangely, THACKERAY – MARCUS, for example, s.v. αἶξ, will not be exhaustive when the total number of occurrences is only two more than are cited), the RENGSTORF concordance lists every occurrence of every word with the exception of a very few common words such as γέ and δέ, which have no characteristic value, though it is precisely such little words that are important for stylistic studies and questions of authorship, since they are, so to speak, the fingerprints of the author. A generous context, usually longer than that in THACKERAY – MARCUS and precisely as it occurs in the text (THACKERAY – MARCUS sometimes inverts the order or does not quote the precise form found in the text and does not usually indicate that it has omitted words in its citations), is given for every occurrence of every word with the exception of prepositions (the fact that this extends to less common prepositions, such as ἀντικρῶς, which is really an adverb and therefore should have citations and meanings listed, is regrettable), conjunctions, pronouns, numbers, and particles. Whereas THACKERAY – MARCUS

seldom uses the Latin translation of Josephus to arrive at the meaning of a given word, RENGSTORF does so more often. Finally RENGSTORF has introductions in both English and German and gives the meanings of words in both languages.

The strengths and weaknesses of RENGSTORF may best be seen by comparing it with THACKERAY – MARCUS. In his introduction RENGSTORF says that it is particularly regrettable that THACKERAY – MARCUS used their lexicon to support THACKERAY's theory that Josephus had assistants for various parts of his work by employing certain notations. In recent years most scholars, as noted below, have looked askance at the theory; but in all fairness to THACKERAY – MARCUS this hardly impairs the usefulness of the lexicon; we need simply ignore the symbols. THACKERAY – MARCUS did not introduce, delete, or slant entries in order to prove this theory. [See *infra*, p. 967.]

RENGSTORF's concordance reinforces one's regret that THACKERAY – MARCUS remains incomplete. It is generally much easier to use the latter than the former. Whereas the latter will give the meaning of a word for every particular occurrence, RENGSTORF is content to list all the meanings at the beginning of an article and generally leaves it to the reader to decide which meaning is best in any given context. Admittedly this has the advantage of keeping open various meanings for any given occurrence, but it will frustrate the average reader's desire to find the meaning in a particular context. Moreover, THACKERAY – MARCUS is an analytical dictionary: for example, it states the cases with which Josephus contrues verbs and prepositions. It organizes entries, as in any dictionary, by the constructions. In RENGSTORF the reader must deduce this kind of information for himself in the case of verbs; with prepositions RENGSTORF gives us no help whatsoever, contenting himself with a mere listing of occurrences without giving any contexts. Similarly, under ἄλλος RENGSTORF simply lists all the occurrences without giving the contexts; THACKERAY – MARCUS very usefully gives the various meanings and cites characteristically Josephan phrases, the most important being the phrase ἐν ἄλλοις, whereby Josephus often refers to other works or passages of his own or of other historians. Some of THACKERAY – MARCUS' most useful entries are precisely for such a word as ἄν, ἀπό, or δέ, where RENGSTORF's entry simply reads *passim*. Moreover, THACKERAY – MARCUS gives us unusual usages: for example, he notes the use of δέ in the apodosis after a genitive absolute, and as the third, fourth, or fifth word in its clause. Or again THACKERAY – MARCUS will indicate when there is a variety in the various grammatical forms, the aorist of ἄγαμαι for example. Similarly they will give cross-references to similar words; e.g., under ἄγγος they refer to ἄγγειον, whereas RENGSTORF has no such references. For certain words, e.g. ἄγενής, "ignoble", THACKERAY – MARCUS wisely separates the entries referring to persons from those referring to things; RENGSTORF has them all undistinguished in the order in which they appear in Josephus. THACKERAY – MARCUS will helpfully note that ἄγεννής, "base", is often used by Josephus with the negative; RENGSTORF leaves this to be inferred by the reader. THACKERAY – MARCUS will tell us that ἄγιος has three terminations in War 5. 384 and two in Antiquities 12. 320; they tell us that ἄγνεία has a different meaning in the singular and in the plural; they very often note obviously parallel passages where

synonyms are used (e.g. ἀμφί in War 5. 12 is parallel to περί in War 5. 11); there is no such information in RENGSTORF. In other words, THACKERAY – MARCUS is a grammar as well as a dictionary; RENGSTORF is a concordance and only incidentally a dictionary.

Furthermore, THACKERAY – MARCUS often notes parallels with the Septuagint, as well as with various Greek authors (not merely Sophocles and Thucydides, the authors who supposedly inspired Josephus' assistants in Antiquities 15–16 and 17–19 respectively). They also tell us that ἄλλοφωνία (Ant. 1. 118), for example, is not attested elsewhere in Greek literature, and that ἄκ (Against Apion 1. 83) is an alleged Egyptian word.

Though RENGSTORF gives an extensive quotation of the context, he does not tell us the broader context. Thus – an important omission – he does not tell us when Josephus is quoting another author (THACKERAY – MARCUS notes such quotations with a special symbol) and when he is quoting a document or decree. THACKERAY – MARCUS will tell us when a word is used in a speech rather than in ordinary narrative. RENGSTORF does not tell us – what will save the scholar time – that ἄγαλμα in Antiquities 19. 11 refers to the statue of Jupiter Capitolinus, and that in War 7. 136 and 151 the statue was carried in a triumphal procession, that the ἄγγαροι in Antiquities 11. 203 refer to the couriers sent by Artaxerxes. THACKERAY – MARCUS, but not RENGSTORF, will tell us when ἁγνεία, “purity”, applies to Essenes, to John the Baptist, Jerusalem, etc. THACKERAY – MARCUS will tell us that ἄγγελι is used in the singular in a simile in War 4. 170; RENGSTORF is silent about such matters as Josephus' use of figures of speech. Though generally RENGSTORF quotes the context more fully, occasionally THACKERAY – MARCUS, as under ἀγένειος (Against Apion 2. 242), will quote more liberally to enable the reader to appreciate Josephus' usage.

In his introduction RENGSTORF indicates that he intends this as a preparatory work for a special Josephus dictionary. It is regrettable that he was not able somehow to join with MOEHRING in combining the virtues of his concordance with those of THACKERAY – MARCUS' Lexicon.

## 26.1: Josephus' Vocabulary: Individual Words

- (3201) GERHARD KITTEL and GERHARD FRIEDRICH, edd.: Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. 9 vols. Stuttgart 1933–73. Trans. into English by GEOFFREY W. BROMILEY: Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 9 vols. Grand Rapids 1964–74.
- (3202) JAMES BARR: The Semantics of Biblical Language. Oxford 1961.
- (3203) CESLAUS SPICQ: Agapè: Problèmes à une Étude de Théologie néo-testamentaire (Studia Hellenistica, 10). Louvain 1955.
- (3203a) ODA WISCHMEYER: Vorkommen und Bedeutung von Agape in der außerchristlichen Antike. In: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 69, 1978, pp. 212–238.
- (3203b) ROBERT A. KRAFT: Towards a Lexicon of Jewish Translation Greek. In his: Septuagintal Lexicography (Septuagintal and Cognate Studies, 1). Missoula, Montana 1972.
- (3203c) See the Addenda, p. 967.
- (3203d) CESLAUS SPICQ: Le vocabulaire de l'esclavage dans le Nouveau Testament. In: Revue Biblique 85, 1978, pp. 201–226.

- (3204) HAIIM B. ROSEN: Asses' Bones (in Hebrew). In: Leshonenu 17, 1950–51, pp. 174–176.
- (3205) SAMUEL KRAUSS: Griechische und Lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum. Vol. 1. Berlin 1898.
- (3206) JOSEPH AMSTUTZ: 'Απλότης: Eine begriffsgeschichtliche Studie zum jüdisch-christlichen Griechisch (Theophaneia, 19). Bonn 1968.
- (3207) GIOVANNI RINALDI: βουλευτής. In: Bibbia e Oriente 8, 1966, pp. 29–30.
- (3207a) MICHAEL J. COOK: Mark's Treatment of the Jewish Leaders (Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 51). Leiden 1978.
- (3207b) PIETER J. SIJPESTEIJN: Flavius Josephus and the Praefect of Egypt in 73 A.D. In: Historia 28, 1979, pp. 117–125.
- (3208) MARTIN J. FIEDLER: Δικαιοσύνη in der diaspora-jüdischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism 1, 1970, pp. 120–143.
- (3209) DEMETRIUS J. GEORGACAS: A Contribution to Greek Word History, Derivation, and Etymology. In: Glotta 36, 1957, pp. 100–122.
- (3210) CHRISTINE MOHRMANN: Études sur le latin des chrétiens. Vol. 1. Rome 1961.
- (3210a) KLAUS BERGER: Volksversammlung und Gemeinde G-ttes. Zu den Anfängen der christlichen Verwendung von 'ekklesia'. In: Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 73, 1976, pp. 167–207.
- (3210b) MARCELLO BUSCEMI: Ἐξαίρεομαι, Verbo di liberazione. In: Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus 29, 1979, pp. 293–314.
- (3211) WALTER GUTBROD: Ἰουδαῖος, Ἰσραήλ, Ἐβραῖος in der griechisch-hellenistischen Literatur. In: GERHARD KITTEL, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 3. Stuttgart 1938. Pp. 370–376. Trans. into English by GEOFFREY W. BROMILEY: Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids 1965. Pp. 369–375.
- (3212) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Korban. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 53, 1962–63, pp. 160–163.
- (3212a) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Korban: A Gift. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 59, 1968–69, pp. 133–135.
- (3212b) JOHN DUNCAN M. DERRETT: ΚΟΡΒΑΝ, Ο ΕΣΤΙΝ ΔΩΡΟΝ. In: New Testament Studies 16, 1969–70, pp. 364–368.
- (3212c) HILDEBRECHT HOMMEL: Das Wort Karban und seine Verwandten. In: Philologus 98, 1954, pp. 132–149. Reprinted in: HILDEBRECHT HOMMEL, ed., Wege zu Aischylos I. Darmstadt 1974. Pp. 368–389.
- (3212d) CHAIM RABIN: The Translation Process and the Character of the Septuagint. In: Textus 6, 1968, pp. 1–26.
- (3212e) GOHEI HATA: The *Jewish War* of Josephus: A Semantic and Historiographic Study. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1975.
- (3213) WALTER GUTBROD: νόμος, C 2: Das Gesetz im Judentum. In: GERHARD KITTEL, Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Vol. 4. Stuttgart 1942. Pp. 1043–1044. Trans. into English by GEOFFREY W. BROMILEY: Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids 1967. Pp. 1050–1052.
- (3214) SVERRE AALEN: A Rabbinic Formula in I Cor. 14, 34. In: Studia Evangelica 2. 1, Berlin 1964, pp. 513–525.
- (3215) CARL J. BJERKELUND: PARAKALÔ. Form, Funktion und Sinn der parakalo-Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen (Bibliotheca Theologica Norvegica, 1). Oslo 1967.
- (3216) MOSHE SCHWABE: Josephus and a Phrase in a Letter of a Hellenistic King (in Hebrew). In: Tarbiz 17, 1945–46, p. 197.
- (3217) CHARLES BRADFORD WELLES: Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. New Haven 1934.
- (3218) DIETER LÜHRMANN: Pistis im Judentum. In: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 64, 1973, pp. 19–38.

- (3218a) SHMUEL SAFRAI: The Synagogue and Its Worship. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH and ZVI BARAS, edd., *Society and Religion in the Second Temple Period* (The World History of the Jewish People, 1. 8). Jerusalem 1977. Pp. 65–98, 338–345.
- (3219) MEINRAD SCHELLER: σαββῶ und σαββάτωσις. In: *Glotta* 34, 1955, pp. 298–300.
- (3219a) BIRGER GERHARDSSON: Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity. Trans. by ERIC J. SHARPE. (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, 22; diss., Uppsala). Uppsala 1961.
- (3219b) GERHARD DELLING: Das letzte Wort der Apostelgeschichte. In: *Novum Testamentum* 15, 1973, pp. 193–204.
- (3219c) ROBERT NORTH: Problemi cruciali della storia biblica archaeologica (chronologica-geografica): I libri di Dio, dir. C. MARTINI et al. Torino 1975.
- (3219d) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: Het Godspredikaat “Het begin en het einde” bij Flavius Josephus en in de openbaring van Johannes: Mededelingen der koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde 39. 1. Amsterdam 1976. Pp. 1–84.
- (3219e) RAMON SUGRANYES DE FRANCH: Études sur le droit palestinien à l’époque évangélique. La contrainte par corps. Fribourg 1946.
- (3219f) HERBERT G. MARSH: The Origin and Significance of the New Testament Baptism. Manchester 1941.
- (3219g) ERNEST MOORE: ΒΙΑΖΩ, ΑΠΙΑΖΩ and Cognates in Josephus. In: *New Testament Studies* 21, 1975, pp. 519–543.
- (3219h) W. H. MARE: The Greek Altar in the New Testament and Inter-Testamental Periods. In: *Grace Journal* 10, 1969, pp. 26–35.
- (3219i) THEOPHIL MIDDENDORP: Die Stellung Jesu ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus. Leiden 1973.
- (3219j) J. A. ZIESLER: The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul. A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry. Cambridge 1972.
- (3219k) GERHARD DAUTZENBERG: Zum religionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der διακρίσις πνευμάτων (1 Kor 12, 10). In *Biblische Zeitschrift* 15, 1971, pp. 93–104.
- (3219l) A. C. THISELTON: The ‘Interpretation of Tongues’: A New Suggestion in the Light of Greek Usage in Philo and Josephus. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 30, 1979, pp. 15–36.
- (3219m) PETER STUHLMACHER: Das paulinische Evangelium. I. Vorgeschichte. (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Der ganzen Reihe, Heft 95; N.F. Heft 77; Habilitationsschrift, Tübingen). Göttingen 1968.
- (3219n) PAUL LAMARCHE: ‘Commencement de l’évangile de Jésus, Christ, Fils de Dieu’ (Mc 1, 1). In: *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 92, 1970, pp. 1024–1036.
- (3219o) HARRY E. FABER VAN DER MEULEN: Das Salomo-Bild im hellenistisch-jüdischen Schrifttum. Diss., Kampen 1978.
- (3219p) KLAUS BERGER: Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu in der synoptischen Tradition und ihr Hintergrund im Alten Testament und im Spätjudentum. Diss., München 1966.
- (3219q) ABRAHAM ARAZY: The Appellations of the Jews (Ioudaios, Hebraios, Israel) in the Literature from Alexander to Justinian. Diss., New York University, New York 1977.
- (3219r) DAVID DAUBE: Three Legal Notes on Josephus after His Surrender. In: *Law Quarterly Review* (London) 93, 1977, pp. 191–194.
- (3219s) WILFRIED PASCHEN: Rein und unrein. Untersuchung zur biblischen Wortgeschichte. München 1970.
- (3219t) KLAUS HAACKER: Erwägungen zu Mc IV 11. In: *Novum Testamentum* 14, 1972, pp. 219–225.
- (3219u) ETHELBERG STAUFFER: Eine Bemerkung zum griechischen Danieltext. In: ERNST Bammel, CHARLES K. BARRETT, and WILLIAM D. DAVIES, edd., *Donum Gentilium: New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube*. Oxford 1978. Pp. 27–39.
- (3219v) J. REUMANN: Heilsgeschichte in Luke: Some Remarks on Its Background and Com-

- parison with Paul. In: *Studia Evangelica* 4.1 (ed. F. L. Cross). Berlin 1968. Pp. 86–115.
- (3219w) WIARD POPKES: *Christus traditus. Eine Untersuchung zum Begriff der Dahingabe im Neuen Testament*. Diss., Zürich 1965. Publ. (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Bd. 49): Zürich–Stuttgart 1967.
- (3219x) A. M. JAVIERRE: *El tema literario de la sucesion en el judaismo y cristianismo primitivo. Prolegómenos para el estudio de la sucesion apostolica*. Zürich 1963.
- (3219y) MARIE E. ISAACS: *The Concept of Spirit. A Study of Pneuma in Hellenistic Judaism and Its Bearing on the New Testament*. (Heythrop Monographs, 1; diss., Oxford). London 1976.
- (3219z) ERNEST BEST: *The Use and Non-Use of Pneuma by Josephus*. In: *Novum Testamentum* 3, 1959, pp. 218–225.
- (3219za) KARL H. RENGSTORF: *Die Re-Investitur des Verlorenen Sohnes in der Gleichniserzählung Jesu Luk 15, 11–32*. Köln und Opladen 1967.
- (3219zb) OTFRIED HOFIUS: *Das 'erste' und das 'zweite' Zelt. Ein Beitrag zur Auslegung von Hbr. 9, 1–10*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 61, 1970, pp. 271–277.
- (3219zc) ERICH DINKLER: *Jesu Wort zum Kreuztragen*. In: WALTHER ELTESTER, ed., *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*. Berlin 1954. Pp. 110–129.
- (3219zd) GEORG BERTRAM: *'Hochmut' und verwandte Begriffe im griechischen und hebräischen Alten Testament*. In: *Die Welt des Orients* 3, 1964–66, pp. 32–43.
- (3219ze) GERHARD DELLING: *Zum steigenden Gebrauch von Komposita mit ὑπέρ bei Paulus*. In: *Novum Testamentum* 11, 1969, pp. 127–153.

KITTEL's (3201) exhaustive dictionary of theological terms in the New Testament has full discussions of the usage of these words in the Septuagint, Philo, and Josephus. Some of the contributors, however, as BARR (3202) has remarked, have failed to realize that the distinctive theological meaning belongs to the word-combination treated in context rather than to the individual word.

SPICQ (3203), pp. 184–191, has an exhaustive discussion of the meaning and usage of ἀγαπάω in Josephus which is of particular value because the word occurs in the 'Testimonium Flavianum' (Ant. 18. 64). He notes that the fundamental meaning is that of a solid attachment and pleasure, that Josephus uses ἀγαπάω predominantly in a profane context, and that it is remarkable that Josephus never uses the noun ἀγάπη.

WISCHMEYER (3203a), p. 235, notes that Josephus frequently uses ἀγαπᾶν with all its classical, Biblical, and rabbinic nuances, but that he does not use ἀγάπη or ἀγάπησις.

KRAFT (3203b), p. 163, notes that Josephus (War 6. 306, 309) consistently uses αἰαῖ rather than some other interjection more common in the Septuagint, such as οὐαί, in recording exclamations of grief. We may comment that inasmuch as the word αἰαῖ occurs in only a single portion of Josephus this may merely indicate that he found it in his source for that passage.

SPICQ (3203d) correlates Josephus with Philo and the New Testament with regard to the words for slavery. He notes, in particular, that ἀνδραποδισμός ('slavery') is associated with devastation and ruin (Ant. 2. 248, 20. 123).

ROSEN (3204) notes that in the Mishnah (Yadaim 4. 6) Homer's works are compared by implication to the bones of a dead ass (*azemoth hamor*). Prompted

by *Against Apion* 1. 12, which speaks of Homer's songs (ᾠμάτων), ROSEN cleverly suggests that we have in the Mishnah a play on words; but we may remark that  $\alpha$  or  $\alpha\iota$  is never transliterated in the Talmudic corpus by the Hebrew letter 'ayin, as KRAUSS (3205), p. 21, has noted.

AMSTUTZ (3206), pp. 42–47, comments particularly on the juxtaposition of ἀπλότης and μεγαλοψυχία in *Antiquities* 7. 332 and concludes that the former stresses the spontaneity of the gift.

RINALDI (3207) notes that Josephus does not use βουλή as a technical term and that he lacks precision in his use of it. Despite RINALDI, however, the term βουλή in the sense of senate and βουλευτής in the sense of senator are found in the 'Antiquities'.

COOK (3207a), p. 88, notes that Josephus' use of γραμματεὺς ("secretary", "clerk") does not parallel that of the Gospels of Mark or Luke. Indeed, he does not present the scribes as a group, whereas the term does appear in rabbinic sources, where it is used interchangeably with "Pharisees".

SIJPESTEIJN (3207b) notes that διαδέχομαι (*War* 7. 434) means, as used by Josephus, that Paulinus "succeeded" Lupus rather than that he "acted" as prefect.

FIEDLER (3208), tracing the development of the word δικαιοσύνη in Philo and Josephus in its relation to Greek philosophy and the Jewish religion, notes that Josephus has a predominantly Greek understanding of the word rather than the connotations of the Hebrew equivalent *zedakah*, though the latter significance is to be found more often in Josephus than in Philo. FIEDLER's investigation suffers from examining δικαιοσύνη without much regard for the context, especially in the first half of the 'Antiquities', where Josephus hellenizes the Bible to a high degree.

GEORGACAS (3209), p. 119, comments on διωρία (*War* 5. 348), citing other occurrences in Hellenistic, medieval and modern Greek of the meaning "fixed time".

MOHRMANN (3210), pp. 282–283, notes that Josephus, inspired by ancient literary tradition, does not employ δόξα in a religious sense.

I have not seen BERGER (3210a), pp. 168ff., who, according to SCHRECKENBERG, discusses the concept of ἐκκλησία in Philo and in Josephus.

I have not seen BUSCEMI (3210b), who discusses the use of the word ἔξαίρεομαι.

GUTBROD (3211) examines the use of the terms Ἰουδαῖος, Ἰσραήλ, and Ἑβραῖος in Hellenistic literature, including especially Philo and Josephus.

ZEITLIN (3212), examining the use of the word κορβάν in the New Testament (*Mark* 7. 11), the Talmudic corpus, and Josephus (*War* 2. 175, *Ant.* 4. 73, and *Against Apion* 1. 167), concludes that it means not "gift", as Josephus declares in *Antiquities* 4. 73, but "vow". The passage in *Against Apion* 1. 167 referring to the oath *korban* as mentioned by Theophrastus is especially convincing.

ZEITLIN (3212a), noting Josephus' citation (*Apion* 1. 167) of Theophrastus' reference to the oath called *korban*, reiterates that *korban* in *Mark* 7. 11 means not a "gift" but a "vow".



DERRETT (3212b), citing Josephus (Apion 1. 166–167), says that Jesus' comments (Matthew 15. 4–6, Mark 7. 9–13) are correct in his interpretation of *korban* as a vow of abstinence.

I have not seen HOMMEL's (3212c) discussion of κορβᾶν. [See *infra*, p. 968.]

RABIN (3212d) says that the context in War 1. 3 clearly shows that the word μεταβάλλω refers to translation. He conjectures that Josephus avoids the Septuagint's more usual term, ἐρμηνεύω, because he was engaged in a more artistic form of translation. We may comment that if so he regarded the Septuagint as an artistic translation, since he uses the same term for it (Ant. 1. 10). Moreover, we may ask why we do not find this term used by other writers to indicate artistic translation.

HATA (3212e) notes that the word μεταβάλλω (War 1. 3) in classical Greek and Hellenistic literature rarely means "to translate" but rather indicates substantial rewriting. We may comment that inasmuch as this meaning is so rare (LIDDELL–SCOTT–JONES, which is admittedly incomplete, cites only Josephus), it is not possible to know the connotation.

GUTBROD (3213) concludes that in his usage of νόμος Josephus combines Jewish, that is Pharisaic, thought with a strong apologetic strain founded on Hellenistic rationalistic and spiritual qualities.

AALen (3214) notes that the phrase οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται in I Corinthians 14. 34 is a rabbinic formula, rarely found in rabbinic literature but frequently found in Josephus (e.g., Ant. 14. 63).

BJERKELUND (3215), pp. 98–104, happily supplies a lacuna in Kittel, who omits discussion of the use of παρακαλῶ in Josephus. He concludes that Josephus, in contrast to Paul, agrees with the Greek historians, notably Dionysius, in his use of the word so far as diplomatic style and terminology are concerned.

SCHWABE (3216) uses War 5. 194 to explain the meaning of the phrase περὶ-εσθλωμένοι ὄροι in a letter cited by WELLES (3217), no. 64, p. 263.

LÜHRMANN (3218) notes that the words πίστις and πιστεύειν are employed by Josephus, as in the Septuagint, to imply "fidelity", rather than anything like "faith".

SAFRAI (3218a) notes that among the names for a synagogue was σαββα-τεῖον (Ant. 16. 164) and that this indicates that the synagogue was open only on the Sabbath. We may comment that inasmuch as this term is apparently, to judge from LIDDELL–SCOTT–JONES, ἀπαξ λεγόμενον, it is precarious to generalize on its meaning as a synagogue or on its significance. As a matter of fact, the one occurrence of the term is in a decree of Augustus in favor of the Jews of Asia, and we may conjecture that it may reflect the fact that some non-Jews thus called the synagogue. To judge from the Talmud, services were held with a quorum in the synagogue not merely on Saturdays but on every day of the week.

SCHELLER (3219) plausibly suggests that the names of the diseases σαββῶ and σαββάτωσις (Against Apion 2. 21, 2. 27) are Alexandrian slang and represent another attempt of Apion to poke fun at the Jews.

GERHARDSSON (3219a), p. 235, comments on the use of the word ἀκριβεία in Josephus in connection with piety. He also, p. 89, comments on the use

of the words σοφιστής and ἐξηγητής (τῶν νόμων) in Josephus. He says that Josephus' translation of Jewish *hakhamim* by σοφισταί is not as remote as we are inclined to believe, since communication and influence did take place, and this is due not merely to his tendency to present material in Hellenistic categories.

DELLING (3219b), in a detailed examination of ἀκωλύτως (Acts 28. 31), suggests that here it may express, as in Josephus (Ant. 12. 104), a religious connotation and an indication that the charges against Paul were quite false.

NORTH (3219c), pp. 407–460, comments on the meaning of the word ἀρχαιολογία in Josephus and its transformation in later use.

I have not read the discussion of VAN UNNIK (3219d) commenting on the formula “the beginning and the end” (ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος) in Josephus (Ant. 8. 280), Philo, Clement of Alexandria, and others.

SUGRANYES DE FRANCH (3219e) notes that in both the ‘Antiquities’ and the New Testament ἄρχοντες does not designate a precise category of magistrates but that they are simply the chiefs of the Jewish people.

MARSH (3219f), pp. 72–74, comments on Josephus' use of the words βαπτίζω (War 4. 137 and Ant. 10. 169) and βαπτιστής (Ant. 18. 116). He concludes that the term βαπτιστής was a popular one for John and was peculiar to him.

MOORE (3219g) examines the verbs βιάζω and ἄρπάζω in order to illuminate the saying in Matthew 11. 12 ἡ βασιλεία οὐρανῶν βιάζεται καὶ βιασταὶ ἄρπάξουσιν αὐτήν. He concludes that these verbs imply direct employment of physical violence (or the threat thereof), particularly when combined to get people to do something against their will, where the one who uses the force has no right to do so. The word ἄρπάζω is particularly frequent in relation to the violence of the rebels, brigands, Zealots, or Sicarii. βιάζω stresses the injustice of the compulsion to a much greater degree than does ἀναγκάζω.

MARE (3219h), pp. 29–30, comments on the use of the word βωμός in Philo and Josephus.

MIDDENDORF (3219i), p. 146, comments on the term *’adōn* in Ben Sira and its equivalent in Antiquities 12. 154–222, 224, 228–236. Similarly, p. 149, he discusses the term *rosh* in Ben Sira and its equivalent (γερονσία) in Antiquities 12. 138, where the head of the city with the power to put people to death was a commander of a fortress. He comments, p. 162, on the phrase “according to the ancestral laws” (κατὰ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους) (Ant. 12. 142) and notes that when Ben Sira refers to the Law of Moses as the “Law of the Highest”, we may ask whether this was not meant also to be political.

ZIESLER (3219j), pp. 110–111, on the basis of THACKERAY and MARCUS' lexicon, concludes that both the ethical and forensic meanings of δικαιοσύνη are found in Josephus, but that the word never occurs in the sense of acquittal. He notes that only a minority of occurrences are in explicit relation to G-d; but we may comment that perhaps this is because Josephus is not a theologian and perhaps because we may question THACKERAY's classifications.

DAUTZENBERG (3219k), pp. 99–102, discusses the words for “interpretation” (ἐρμηνεία, etc.) in the Septuagint, Philo, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the New Testament, and Josephus.

THISELTON (3219l) notes that in the passages which relate to the speaking in tongues in 1 Corinthians 12–14, there are four instances of *διερμηνεύω*, two of *ἐρμηνεία*, and one of *διερμηνευτής*. All the major versions translate these to refer to the “interpretation” of tongues; but, on the basis of Philo and Josephus, THISELTON shows that these words often mean not to translate or to interpret but simply “to put into words”. He admits that sixteen of the twenty-four occurrences of *ἐρμηνεύω* mean “to translate”, but no less than twelve of these appear in Book 12 of the ‘Antiquities’ with regard to the Septuagint. He, moreover, notes several examples (War 5. 182, 5. 393, 7. 455; Ant. 3. 87, 6. 230) where *ἐρμηνεύω* and *ἐρμηνεύς* can refer only to the production of articulate speech.

STUHLMACHER (3219m), pp. 164–172, deals with Josephus’ use of the words *εὐαγγέλιον*, *εὐαγγελία*, and *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, as well as their usage in other Hellenistic Jewish writers. He says that in his usage of these words, for which he is a very rich source, he utilizes both Jewish and explicit Hellenistic traditions.

LAMARCHE (3219n) notes that Josephus uses the word *εὐαγγέλιον* often in verbal form and as a substantive, applying it several times to the enthronement of Vespasian (War 4. 618, 4. 656). A similar usage, referring to the beginning of a king’s reign, may be seen in Isaiah and in midrashim.

FABER VAN DER MEULEN (3219o) remarks on the parallels between Josephus and both early and late classical authors in their usage of the terms *εὐνομία*, *δίκη*, and *εὐσέβεια*.

BERGER (3219p), pp. 96–97 and 104–105, comments that *εὐσέβεια* and *δικαιοσύνη* are a royal ideal.

ARAZY (3219q), pp. 169–181, speaks of the appellations of the names of the Jews (*Ἰουδαῖος*, *Ἑβραῖος*) from a historical point of view. The term *Ἑβραῖος* is used for those descended from Abraham until the last king of Judea. The term *Ἰουδαῖοι* is used for the Jews during the period from Nehemiah to 70. He argues (p. 116) that Apion, in using the appellation *Ἰουδαῖοι*, was engaging in a deliberate propaganda effort on a universal scale to deprive the term of its respectability. We may comment that ARAZY is hardly exhaustive in surveying references to these names and that he shows a very spotty knowledge of the secondary literature. As to ARAZY’s contention concerning the use of the term *Ἰουδαῖος* in Josephus, his theory is hardly proven: as a matter of fact, the term had been used since Theophrastus and had been used in a non-derogatory way by such contemporaries of Apion as Diodorus, Nicolaus, and Strabo.

DAUBE (3219r) asserts that *κελεύσαντος* (Life 414) is a Latinism having one of the meanings of *iubeo*, “to authorize”. He also explains the meaning of *συγχωρήσας αὐτὰς τῇ προτέρᾳ τύχῃ* (Life 419) as “restoring them to their true condition”, that is, their temporary arrest did not count, and they were rescued so as to retain their original status.

PASCHEN (3219s), pp. 108–114, comments on Josephus’ use of *καθαρός* and, p. 167, remarks on the use of the word *κοινός* in Josephus.

HAACKER (3219t) notes that Mark in the New Testament uses *μυστήριον* with the force of an adjective to mean the “hidden kingdom”, and cites as parallels for this II Thessalonians 2. 7 and Josephus, War 1. 470.

STAUFFER (3219u) remarks on the word *νεώτερος* in the story of Susanna and on similar terms for youths in Josephus.

REUMANN (3219v), pp. 105–108, remarks on the historical theological vocabulary of Josephus (*οἰκονομία*, *πρόνοια*, and the *παρουσία* of G-d) and its comprehension of the history of salvation. He also comments (p. 109) on Josephus’ reference to G-d as *δεσπότης*.

POPKES (3219w), pp. 100–113, comments on the meanings of *παράδοσις*, *διαδέχεσθαι*, *διαδοχή*, and *διάδοχος* and their applications.

JAVIERRE (3219x), pp. 252–267, investigates the ideas of *παράδοσις*, *διαδέχεσθαι*, *διαδοχή*, and *διάδοχος* and their applications.

ISAACS (3219y), pp. 37–39, remarks that just as the Septuagint on occasion uses *πνεῦμα* of man’s spirit, so does Josephus, who does not seem to differentiate between *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή* (Ant. 11. 240) and indeed on occasion actually introduces it into the text. In view of the fact that Josephus used Greek amanuenses, the fact that he retains *πνεῦμα* in its sense of *ψυχή* is more remarkable than its replacement by *ψυχή*. Hence ISAACS disagrees with BEST (3219z) that Josephus has modified his use of *πνεῦμα* on the basis of normal pagan Greek usage. Finally, ISAACS concludes that Josephus knows that the word *ruah* is the Hebrew equivalent for *πνεῦμα*.

RENGSTORF (3219za) cites Josephus, a contemporary of Luke, as precedent for the usage of *πρώτος* in the sense of *πρότερος*, and *στολή* as a garment of emblematic character which is an ornament of a ruler.

HOFIUS (3219zb) remarks that the use of the phrase *πρώτη σκηνή* for the first tabernacle and *δεύτερα σκηνή* for the Holy of Holies in the New Testament (Hebrews 9. 2–8) is surprising because they were not two independent tents. HOFIUS clarifies the meaning of these phrases on the basis of Josephus’ references to the outer court of the Temple as *τὸ πρῶτον ἱερόν* and the inner court accessible only to the Jews as *τὸ δεύτερον ἱερόν* (War 5. 193–195), whereas the whole Temple area is termed *τὸ ἱερόν* (War 5. 184, 186). A second parallel is to be found in War 5. 208–209, where Josephus twice speaks of the antechamber of the temple as *ὁ πρῶτος οἶκος*.

DINKLER (3219zc), citing Josephus (War 2. 241, 2. 306, 2. 308, 5. 449, 5. 451), asks whether the word *στανρός* can stand as a traditional picture of suffering and sacrifice. He answers that such a view is not to be found in the older rabbinic literature. We may comment that crucifixion is certainly painful; and to that degree suffering is clearly implied.

BERTRAM (3219zd) comments on Josephus’ use (Ant. 5. 145) of the word *ὑβρίζειν* for Hebrew *‘alal*.

DELLING (3219ze) concludes that Paul and Josephus are similar in their use of words compounded with *ὑπέρ* to strengthen the meaning of simple words which were beginning to become weaker.

## 26.2: Proper Names in Josephus

- (3220) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*. In: KARL H. RENGSTORF, ed., *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*, Supplement 1. Leiden 1968.
- (3221) ADOLF SCHLATTER: *Die hebräischen Namen bei Josephus*. Gütersloh 1913.
- (3222) DOUGLAS L. M. DREW: *Two Literary Puzzles from Palestine*. In: *Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Cairo, Fouad I University*, 13.2, 1951, pp. 53–60.
- (3223) MILKA CASSUTO-SALZMANN: *Greek Names among the Jews (in Hebrew)*. In: *Erez-Israel* 3, 1954, pp. 186–190.
- (3224) NAOMI G. COHEN: *Jewish Names and Their Significance in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods in Asia Minor (in Hebrew)*. Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1969. 2 vols.
- (3225) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Biblical Names and Their Meanings in Josephus*, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books I and II, 1–200. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 2, 1971, pp. 167–182.
- (3226) NAOMI G. COHEN: *Rabbi Meir: A Descendant of Anatolian Proselytes: New Light on His Name and the Historic Kernel of the Nero Legend in Giṭṭin 56a*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 23, 1972, pp. 51–59.
- (3226a) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: *ΙΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ / ΙΕΡΟΥΧΟΛΥΜΑ*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 65, 1974, pp. 273–276.
- (3226b) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: *The Hasmoneans: The Dynasty of G-d's Resistor's [sic]*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 68, 1975, pp. 53–58.
- (3226c) JOSEPH A. FITZMYER and DANIEL J. HARRINGTON: *A Manual of Palestinian Aramaic Texts (Second Century B.C.–Second Century A.D.)* (*Biblica et Orientalia*, 34). Rome 1978.

SCHALIT (3220) gives for all proper names in Josephus the Greek form, a brief identification, the Masoretic Hebrew equivalent if any, and the spelling in the Septuagint. He also has a Hebrew-Greek index. SCHALIT often challenges and corrects the pioneering work of SCHLATTER (3221) and suggests a number of emendations. We may remark, however, that SCHALIT might have done well to cite also the forms of proper names as they appear in the Latin translation of Josephus, as well as in the Slavonic version and in Josippon, since they, especially the Latin version, often reflect older manuscript traditions than those that are extant in Greek.

DREW (3222), in the first of two notes, comments on the plays on words on the names of the Jewish generals Onias and Dositheos, whom Apion ridiculed on this account (*Against Apion* 2. 49).

CASSUTO-SALZMANN (3223) presents a brief survey of the sources and of the various types of names (including double names of Greek and Jewish origin) during antiquity and the Middle Ages.

COHEN (3224) co-ordinates the epigraphic evidence with Josephus and concludes that, contrary to what is generally assumed, the names of the Jews say very little about the religious beliefs of those who gave them but testify only to the social and cultural milieu to which they wished to belong. She says, for example (vol. 1, part 3, pp. 22–23), that the names in Josephus of the Jewish envoys of Judas Maccabee and of the Hasmoneans to Rome, as well as of the Herodian dynasty and of the envoys to Claudius are of the general Hellenistic rather than of purely Hebrew type. She says that the names do not prove that

the Jews were assimilated, since the majority of those mentioned represented traditional and national circles. We may comment that the very fact that they were chosen as envoys indicates that they knew Greek and Greek ways, or that their names may have been Hellenized by Josephus, or that they may have had double names, as is so often the case with Jews today, a Hebrew and a secular one.

SHUTT (3225), examining the proper names in Genesis as they appear in Josephus, cautiously concludes that Josephus used both the Hebrew text and the Septuagint but preferred the Septuagint, though he is sometimes independent of both. We may remark that SHUTT fails to consider that Josephus' Septuagint may have been different from that of any of our manuscripts. The Dead Sea Scrolls show that the gap between the Septuagint and the Hebrew text may not have been as great as previously thought. Moreover, SHUTT makes no attempt to consider systematically the various manuscripts of the Septuagint, Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', the Latin version (as edited by BLATT), the Aramaic Targumim, or the rabbinic midrashim (except as cited by THACKERAY in his Loeb version). In particular, we may note that in a number of cases Josephus, as shown by his agreement with Pseudo-Philo, is following a Jewish tradition in proper names, even if it is not in the Septuagint or in the Hebrew.

COHEN (3226), arguing that the name of Rabbi Meir reflects an origin among proselytes in Asia Minor, thus confirming the Talmudic statement that he was a descendant of the Emperor Nero, notes that before the Middle Ages he is the only Jew known to us who bore this name and that possible instances in Josephus do not really reflect this name, though we must say that Meirus (Μηῖ-ρός) son of Belgas, who plunged into the fire while the Temple was being consumed (War 6. 280), sounds very much like Meir.

JEREMIAS (3226a) notes that in the New Testament the spelling Ἱερουσαλήμ is found 76 times, whereas the form Ἱεροσόλυμα occurs 63 times. The former is used almost exclusively by Jewish authors; the latter is the spelling employed by non-Jewish writers and by those Jews, such as Josephus, addressing a Greek-speaking audience. He cites the quotation from Clearchus of Soli in Josephus (Apion 1. 179), where the Latin translation has probably preserved the best reading, Hierosolyma.

GOLDSTEIN (3226b) notes that the name 'Hasmonay' is conspicuous by its absence in I Maccabees, though it is used by Josephus (Ant. 12. 265). He suggests that perhaps the members of the dynasty found the name offensive for some reason, possibly because it recalled their obscure origins. We may, however, ask why Josephus, who was himself a descendant of the Hasmoneans and proud of it, mentioned the name.

FITZMYER and HARRINGTON (3226c), p. 230, commenting on the Kallon Family Ossuary, note, as a parallel for the name Selanşion in Greek, Josephus' Σαλαμψιώ (Ant. 18. 130).

### 26.3: Josephus' Statements about His Knowledge of Greek

- (3227) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 9, *Jewish Antiquities*, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965.
- (3228) BARUCH LIFSHITZ, rev.: JAN N. SEVENSTER, Do You Know Greek? (in Hebrew). In: *Kirjath Sepher* 45, 1968–69, pp. 379–385.
- (3229) ALBERT DEBRUNNER: *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, 2: Grundfragen und Grundzüge des nachklassischen Griechisch. Berlin 1954.
- (3230) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus*. Gießen 1920.
- (3231) JAN N. SEVENSTER: Do You Know Greek? How Much Greek Could the First Jewish Christians Have Known? Leiden 1968.
- (3232) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: JAN N. SEVENSTER, Do You Know Greek? In: *Classical World* 63, 1969–70, pp. 167–168.
- (3233) DANIEL SPERBER, rev.: JAN N. SEVENSTER, Do You Know Greek? (in Hebrew). In: *Leshonenu* 34, 1970, pp. 225–227.
- (3234) WILHELM VISCHER: Savez-vous le grec? In: *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 45, 1970, pp. 63–87.
- (3235) JOSEPH A. FITZMYER: The Languages of Palestine in the First Century A.D. In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 32, 1970, pp. 501–531. Reprinted in his: *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 25). Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 29–56.
- (3236) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Hellenism and the Jews. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 295–301.
- (3236a) NATHAN DRAZIN: *History of Jewish Education from 515 B.C.E. to 220 C.E. (During the Periods of the Second Commonwealth and the Tannaim)*. Baltimore 1940 (reprinted from *The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Education*, no. 29; published also as diss., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore 1937). Trans. into Hebrew by MEIR ZALZER: Jerusalem 1965.
- (3236b) KURT TREU: Die Bedeutung des Griechischen für die Juden im römischen Reich. In: *Kairos* 15, 1973, pp. 123–144.

Josephus himself (Ant. 20. 263) comments on his knowledge of Greek, but there is a considerable difference of opinion as to his meaning. “I have also labored strenuously”, he writes, according to my (3227) Loeb version, “to partake of the realm of Greek prose (γροαμάτων) and poetry, after having gained a knowledge of Greek grammar (τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐμπειρίαν), although the habitual use of my native tongue has prevented my attaining precision in the pronunciation”. For “prose” others translate “language” or “learning”; and two of the three major manuscripts omit “and poetry”. For “the habitual use of my native tongue” an alternate translation may be “the usages of our nation”, since the sentence which immediately follows (Ant. 20. 264) states that “our people do not favor those persons who have mastered the speech of many nations”. For “pronunciation” LIFSHITZ (3228) suggests “style”, and this would seem to be supported by the sentence that follows, that the Jews do not favor those who adorn their style with smoothness of diction; but, we may comment, such a meaning is apparently without precedent, to judge from the entry in LIDDELL–SCOTT–JONES’ Greek lexicon.

Josephus does not note the objection to Greek wisdom in particular, though he tells a story (Ant. 14. 25–28) similar to that in the rabbinic passage (Sotah 49b, Baba Kamma 82b, Menahoth 64b) about the interruption of the

sacrifices. The rabbis add, however, that in the civil war between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus (63 B.C.E.) it was decreed that "cursed be the man who teaches his son Greek wisdom". Josephus' statement that the Jews frowned upon those who have mastered (ἐκμαθόντες) other languages is not, we may comment, contradicted by the fact that so much evidence of Greek is found in inscriptions, since these indicate merely a day-to-day working knowledge, rather than a profound knowledge of Greek.

DEBRUNNER (3229), p. 79, says that we can see how little Greek was prevalent in the land of Israel from the fact that Josephus needed helpers for the 'Jewish War'; but, we may comment, the inscriptions and the amount of Greek in the midrashim show how widespread was a working knowledge of Greek. What was rare, as Josephus notes (Ant. 20. 264), was a mastery of foreign languages. There is, moreover, a considerable difference between a working knowledge of a language and an ability to write a literary work in it.

Moreover, as LAQUEUR (3230) had already suggested, Josephus' statements about his knowledge of Greek may be mere apologetic: what he is saying is, as he had stated in the preface to both the 'War' (1. 2) and the 'Antiquities' (1. 4), that style is not important but that truth is, since any slave can speak Greek well (Ant. 20. 264).

SEVENSTER (3231), as I (3232) have noted in my review, adopts, pp. 61–76, my (3227) understanding of Antiquities 20. 262–265, and concludes that the author of the Epistle of James may well have employed the same means as Josephus, namely obtaining help from another member of the Jewish congregation who was better acquainted with Greek. The fact that Josephus says (Ant. 20. 264) that ordinary freemen and even slaves have attained a mastery of the style in other languages would support such a hypothesis. SEVENSTER is careful not to conclude from the case of Josephus that Jews in the land of Israel knew Greek but only that they might have consulted assistants. Co-ordinating the literary and epigraphic evidence, he asserts that Greek could be heard in all circles of Jewish society in Palestine. SEVENSTER's book, as SPERBER (3233) has remarked, though a valuable survey of the extant material, is somewhat marred by its theological tendentiousness. As to Josephus, we must recall that he wrote not in Jerusalem but in Rome, where, as the inscriptions of the Jewish catacombs show, the Jews were Greek-speaking, that for the 'War' he had assistants, as he himself (Against Apion 1. 50) says, and that he was able to dispense with them apparently (and even here there is dispute) only twenty years later when he wrote his 'Antiquities', 'Life', and 'Against Apion'.

VISCHER (3234), in an extended review of SEVENSTER, with whom he generally agrees, comments, pp. 71–74, in particular, on Josephus' statement with regard to the knowledge of Greek by Jews in the land of Israel. He concludes that Josephus' attitude toward Greek reflects not that of an individual but of a large part of the Jewish community; the epigraphic evidence, in particular, we may comment, bears out this statement.

FITZMYER (3235), pp. 510–512, on the whole, agrees with SEVENSTER's discussion of Josephus' knowledge of Greek but says that Josephus' testimony leaves the picture of Greek in first-century Palestine unclear, though he admits



that many other considerations persuade us that Greek was widely used at this time and that, in fact, despite Josephus' testimony, some Palestinian Jews spoke only Greek. We may comment that Josephus says (Ant. 20. 264) that the Jews object to the mastery of many languages and to undue attention to style; the inscriptions reveal an elementary acquaintance with one language and hardly a mastery of style, such mastery having been attained by freemen and even slaves.

I (3236) conclude that while knowledge of Greek in the land of Israel was widespread the level of knowledge was not high.

DRAZIN (3236a), pp. 100–102, cites Josephus often, but uncritically, on the question of the Jews', and in particular Josephus', study of the Greek language and culture during the Talmudic period.

TREU (3236b), pp. 127–128, concludes that Greek was not Josephus' mother-tongue but an indispensable help to work in the world, particularly vis-à-vis the Romans, whose goodwill he sought.

#### 26.4: Josephus' Language and Style

- (3237) ELCHANAN STEIN: *De Woordenkeuze in het Bellum Judaicum van Flavius Josephus*. Diss., Leiden. Publ.: Amsterdam 1937.
- (3238) STANISLAW SKIMINA: *État actuel des études sur le rythme de la prose grecque*. Cracovie 1937.
- (3239) ISAAC HEINEMANN: *Josephus' Method in the Presentation of Jewish Antiquities (in Hebrew)*. In: *Zion* 5, 1939–40, pp. 180–203.
- (3240) SVEN EK: *Herodotismen in der jüdischen Archäologie des Josephos und ihre textkritische Bedeutung*. In: *Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund. Acta Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis* 2, Lund 1945–46, pp. 27–62, 213.
- (3241) ALBERT DEBRUNNER: *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache*, 2: *Grundfragen und Grundzüge des nachklassischen Griechisch*. Berlin 1954.
- (3242) JOHANNES (IOANNES) T. KAKRIDIS (KAKRIDES): *Ποικίλα Ἑλληνικά* (in modern Greek). In: *Hellenica* 13, 1954, pp. 165–174.
- (3243) STANISLAS GIET: *Un procédé littéraire d'exposition: l'anticipation chronologique*. In: *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 2, 1956, pp. 243–249.
- (3244) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: *Flavius Josephus, Adaptateur de la Lettre d'Aristée. Une réaction attisante contre la Koinè (Études et Commentaires, 45)*. Paris 1962.
- (3245) BENIAMIN NADEL: *Józef Flawiusz a terminologia rzymskiej inwektywy politycznej* (in Polish: = *Josephus Flavius and the Terminology of Roman Political Invective*). In: *Eos* 56, 1966, pp. 256–272.
- (3246) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (3247) MENAHEM STERN: *The Greek and Latin Literary Sources*. In: SHMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, in co-operation with DAVID FLUSSER and WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK, *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, Section 1)*. Assen 1974. Pp. 18–37.
- (3248) OTTO MICHEL: *Ich komme* (Jos. Bell. III, 400). In: *Theologische Zeitschrift* 24, 1968, pp. 123–124.

- (3249) BERNHARD JUSTUS: Zur Erzählkunst des Flavius Josephus. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 107–136.
- (3250) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (3251) ANDREW Q. MORTON and SIDNEY MICHAELSON: Elision as an Indicator of Authorship in Greek Writers. In: *Revue de l'Organisation Internationale pour l'Étude des Langues Anciennes par Ordinateur*, 1973, 3, pp. 33–56.
- (3252) HAROLD W. ATTRIDGE: The Presentation of Biblical History in the *Antiquitates Judaicae* of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1975. Publ. as: *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Missoula, Montana 1976.
- (3252a) VICTOR C. PFITZNER: Paul and the Agon Motif. Traditional Athletic Imagery in Pauline Literature. Leiden 1967.
- (3252b) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus. Leiden 1977.
- (3252c) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: Studies in the Language and Historiography of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Brown University, Providence 1976.
- (3252d) GUILIELMUS SCHMIDT: De Flavii Josephi Elocutione Observationes Criticae. Pars Prior. Diss., Göttingen. Publ.: Leipzig 1893. Published in fuller form in: *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, Supplement 20, Leipzig 1894, pp. 341–550.

STEIN (3237) has a thorough investigation of Josephus' choice of words. He concludes that Josephus was particularly well versed in a wide range of authors, notably Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Polybius, Homer, the tragedians, and Demosthenes. There is a useful grammatical bibliography.

SKIMINA (3238), pp. 171–172, on the basis of an analysis of the prose rhythms in Josephus, concludes that IV Maccabees, ascribed to Josephus in some of the manuscripts, differs considerably from the other works in its clausulae (prose rhythm at the end of sentences). He notes that 'Against Apion' is especially rich in clausulae and that the other works agree in their treatment of the clausulae. He notes that the 'War', for which, we recall, Josephus admits having had assistants for the sake of the Greek, avoids hiatus very carefully, but that the 'Antiquities' does not, whereas the other works are intermediate.

HEINEMANN (3239) has a general survey of Josephus' narrative style, noting his indebtedness, especially to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, whose 'Roman Antiquities', like the 'Jewish Antiquities' of Josephus, consisted of twenty books, and to Jewish writers on religious subjects. But, we may comment, Josephus is more Greek and less Jewish than HEINEMANN would make him, and there is less originality in his style than HEINEMANN would have us believe.

EK (3240) has a thorough study of Herodotean reminiscences in the 'Antiquities'. In several places this has enabled him to reject an emendation of NIESE in favor of a textual reading which is Herodotean.

DEBRUNNER (3241), pp. 94, 99, notes that Josephus wrote an Atticistic *koinē* Greek but that he was hardly artistic, though he has several more obvious Atticisms, such as his usage of ἐτετάχατο, περί, and ἀμφί, and his reinstitution of the dual of the verb εἰμί (Ant. 18. 168).

KAKRIDIS (3242) cites War 1. 436 (τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἦν μῖσος εἰς αὐτὸν τῆς Μαριάμης, ὅσος ἐκείνου πρὸς αὐτὴν ἔρωσ) as an illustration of Josephus' use of antithesis.

GIET (3243) notes examples in *Antiquities* 18. 1–25, 36–38, 55–89, and 90–124, of a stylistic device, also found in Luke and Acts, which consists of anticipating, in the course of a narrative, a part of the outcome, in order not to return to a subject which disappears from the scene.

PELLETIER (3244) examines Josephus' reworking of the 'Letter of Aristeas' (*Ant.* 12. 11–118) from the point of view of vocabulary, grammar, word order, prose rhythms, and style as an example of the Greek taught in the Roman schools of rhetoric at the end of the first century C.E. He concludes that Josephus, as compared with the 'Letter of Aristeas', marks an Atticizing reaction against the *koinē*. As noted above, the work on metrical clausulae is less than adequate, and he has been less than thorough in his examination of the vocabulary of other Hellenistic and Atticist authors, for whom, to be sure, we lack adequate lexica.

NADEL (3245) asserts but does not conclusively prove that in his invectives against the Zealots and Sicarii Josephus drew upon several Latin authors, notably the orations of Cicero and the works of Sallust. THACKERAY (3246), pp. 119–120, we may note, had already called attention to parallels in Josephus' black portrait of John of Gischala and Sallust's description of Catiline (*De Catilinae coniuratione* 5).

STERN (3247), p. 29, asserts that there is evidence of Josephus' use of Latin sources in *Antiquities* 18. 39–54 and 20. 154. We may comment that the former contains Josephus' account of the love affair of Phraates king of Parthia and the Italian slave girl Thesmusia; and it is more likely that Josephus' source for this, as for the extended account of Asinaeus and Anilaeus, the two Babylonian Jews who successfully defied the Parthians and set up a quasi-independent state in Babylonia, comes from an Aramaic work, since this was the language of the Babylonian Jews. As to *Antiquities* 20. 154–157, it merely states that many historians have written about Nero, some of whom have been unduly favorable, while others have been unduly hostile to him: there is no indication that Josephus used any of these in writing his works.

MICHEL (3248), commenting on ἡλθον-sayings in the Synoptic tradition, cites a parallel in *War* 3. 400, where Josephus announces his own 'prophetic' role with a ἦκω-saying. He conjectures that the latter form in the present tense is the more original form of this type of saying.

JUSTUS (3249) comments on stylistic aspects of the double narrative, with its antithesis, of Paulina (*Ant.* 18. 66–80) and Fulvia (*Ant.* 18. 81–84). He notes a series of episodes repeating similar themes in 'Antiquities', Book 18. He concludes that Josephus in literary technique is following the tragic school of Hellenistic historians.

SCHALIT (3250), p. 257, concludes that Josephus' deficient command of literary Greek is apparent in the 'Antiquities', the language of which is considerably more artificial and more labored than that in the 'War', the careful language of which, he suggests, probably resulted from its official character.

MORTON and MICHAELSON (3251) compare the occurrence of crasis and elision of ἄλλὰ, δέ, and οὐ in several authors, including Josephus, and conclude that the 'Antiquities' is significantly different from the 'War' (though only, we

may note, in the instance of δέ, but not of ἀλλά). Book 7 (including the Masada episode) of the 'War' is apparently different in style from the other books, and this may indicate a different source or insufficient editing to eliminate inconsistencies. MORTON and MICHAELSON note different rates of elision for various parts of 'Against Apion'. The 'Life', they conclude, is not significantly different from the 'War' but is definitely different from the other works; on this basis, we may comment, the 'Life' and the 'War' would seem to have a common source, and/or the 'Life' is dependent upon the 'War'.

ATTRIDGE (3252) investigates particular literary techniques, especially character-evaluation and psychologizing.

PFITZNER (3252a), pp. 69–72, notes that although he rejects the Greek goal of striving for acclamation and honor, Josephus retains the terminology of the games, especially as applied to military affairs and to the rewards for piety toward G-d. In this respect parallels may be found in Philo and in IV Maccabees.

One major result of SCHRECKENBERG's (3252b) text criticism is a new insight into the stylistic and linguistic unity of Josephus' works and a further refutation of THACKERAY's theory of a Thucydidean and a Sophoclean assistant for portions of the 'Antiquities'. We may remark that insufficient attention has been given, except by PELLETIER, to the text of Josephus as a forerunner of the revival of Atticizing Greek in the following century.

LADOUCEUR (3252c) stresses how little the study of Josephus' language has progressed since SCHMIDT (3252d).

## 26.5: Speeches and Letters in Josephus

- (3253) MARTIN DIBELIUS: Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte und die antike Geschichtsschreibung (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Jhrg. 1949, 1. Abt.). Heidelberg 1949. Rpt. in his: Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte, ed. by HEINRICH GREEVEN. Göttingen 1951. Pp. 120–162. Trans. into English by MARY LING: The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography. In: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. New York 1956. Pp. 138–191.
- (3254) MOSHE D. HERR: The Problem of War on the Sabbath in the Second Temple and the Talmudic Periods (in Hebrew). In: Tarbiz 30, 1960–61, pp. 242–256, 341–356.
- (3255) OTTO BAUERNFEIND and OTTO MICHEL: Die beiden Eleazarreden in Jos. bell. 7, 323–336; 7, 341–388. In: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 58, 1967, pp. 267–272.
- (3256) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the Sefer Ha-Kabbalah with Special Emphasis on Josephus. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 59, 1968–69, pp. 171–214; 60, 1969–70, pp. 37–68.
- (3257) DONNA R. RUNNALLS: Hebrew and Greek Sources in the Speeches of Josephus' *Jewish War*. Diss., University of Toronto 1971.
- (3258) HELGO LINDNER: Die Geschichtsauffassung des Flavius Josephus in Bellum Judaicum. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage (Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums, 12). Diss., University of Tübingen 1971. Publ.: Leiden 1972.

- (3259) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Did Agrippa Write a Letter to Gaius Caligula? In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 56, 1965–66, pp. 22–31.
- (3259a) DAVID R. CATCHPOLE: The Problem of the Historicity of the Sanhedrin Trial. In: *Festschrift C. F. D. Moule*. London 1970. Pp. 47–65.
- (3259b) FRED O. FRANCIS: The Parallel Letters in Josephus' *Antiquities* and I Maccabees. Summary in PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER, ed., *Abstracts, Society of Biblical Literature*. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 25–26.
- (3259c) JOHN L. WHITE: Royal Correspondence in Pseudo-Aristeas and the Parallel Letters in Josephus and Eusebius. Summary in PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER, ed., *Abstracts, Society of Biblical Literature*. Missoula, Montana 1979. P. 26.
- (3259d) FRANZ KOBLER: *A Treasury of Jewish Letters: Letters from the Famous and the Humble*. Vol. 1. Philadelphia 1952. Rpt.: *Letters of the Jews through the Ages from Biblical Times to the Middle of the Eighteenth Century*. Philadelphia 1978.
- (3259e) GOHEI HATA: *The Jewish War of Josephus: A Semantic and Historiographic Study*. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1975.
- (3259f) ROLAND G. BOMSTAD: *Governing Ideas of the Jewish War of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., Yale University, New Haven 1979.

DIBELIUS (3253) notes that ancient historians have speeches containing maxims from which are developed philosophical doctrines expounded not in the interest of the historical situation but in order to inform the reader. He cites as an example Josephus, *War* 3. 361ff., where, in a highly precarious situation, Josephus still finds time to speak against suicide. Again, Josephus avoids the drama of the recognition scene in the Joseph story, favoring instead detailed speeches (*Ant.* 2. 140ff.) which contain many 'truths'. Furthermore, as DIBELIUS remarks, the speeches are not bound to the historical events in the setting in which we find them. Thus, in *Antiquities* 2. 22, Reuben, seeking to restrain his brothers from killing Joseph, argues that such a deed would cause grief to Joseph's mother, whereas actually Joseph's mother is dead.

HERR (3254), in the light of the well-known liberties which ancient historians took with speeches in their narratives, properly decides that no conclusion may be drawn from Agrippa II's speech (*War* 2. 345–404) to the people at the outbreak of the war against Rome, which is mere demagoguery, or from the words of John of Gischala to Titus (*War* 4. 98–102).

BAUERNFEIND and MICHEL (3255) note the mixture of Jewish and Hellenistic elements in the two speeches of Eleazar at Masada. The first speech, which is homogeneous and logical, is more historical; but the second, which contains a didactic and eschatological review of the same material, also, they assert, has historical elements.

ZEITLIN (3256), pp. 178–214, is especially concerned with analyzing the role of speeches in Josephus, which, he says, conformed to Greek historiographical practice. He admits that though the speeches in Josephus contain imaginary elements, as, for instance, in the case of Eleazar ben Jair at Masada (*War* 7. 323–388), some of these are historical, as, for example, his own and that of Titus, though these are not exact. He comments (pp. 37–68) also on the style of letters in Josephus, for example that of Jonathan to Josephus (*Life* 217–218), and concludes that the recently discovered Bar Kochba letters are not authentic, since they bear a signature, which is not the style found in Josephus. We may

comment, however, that Josephus is reproducing the style in Latin letters that he knew in Rome; Bar Kochba may have adopted the style prevalent among Jews in the land of Israel.

RUNNALLS (3257) gives the Greek text of eight deliberative speeches, examines them for literary style, comments on their sources, and cites parallels to them. She concludes that six of the speeches have been written in conformity with the rules of Greco-Roman rhetoric, while the other two, said to have been delivered by Josephus himself, conform to the pattern of the Jewish sermon as it developed during the period under the influence of the Stoic-Cynic diatribe. She concludes, from an examination of the literary form and style, that the speeches were not in the original form in which they were delivered in Aramaic or Hebrew, and that they are Josephus' means of presenting his own theological and ideological views.

LINDNER (3258) examines three speeches in particular, those of Agrippa II (War 2. 345–401: pp. 20 ff.), Josephus (War 5. 362–419: pp. 25 ff.), and Eleazar ben Jair (War 7. 323–336, 341–388: pp. 33 ff.), and concludes that they are used as vehicles to express Josephus' own views.

ZEITLIN (3259) concludes that neither Agrippa's letter to Gaius Caligula (Philo, *Legatio ad Gaium* 276–329) nor his speech to him (Ant. 18. 294–297) corresponds to the facts, being composed in the spirit of ancient historiography. We may comment that the rhetorical aspects of the speech undoubtedly are invented, but the facts, as Thucydides (1. 22) prescribes, are carefully to be adhered to.

CATCHPOLE (3259a), p. 58, remarks that form-critical observations on the speech-writing technique of Josephus make it probable that the definition of "eve of the Sabbath" (Ant. 16. 163) is an anachronism belonging to his own time.

FRANCIS (3259b) discusses the relationship between letters quoted by Josephus and by I Maccabees and their original form, noting in particular whether epistolary conventions are abbreviated when quoted thus.

WHITE (3259c), making a similar investigation of three letters written during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, notes, in particular, opening and closing conventions and compares them with contemporary letters written on papyri and with inscriptions.

KOBLER (3259d), pp. 63–64, quotes, in the Loeb translation with brief introductions, two letters from Agrippa II (Life 364–367) to Josephus. He remarks on the bitter but unintentional irony in them.

HATA (3259e) suggests that some of the ideas and expressions in Josephus' speeches may have been taken from Polybius.

BOMSTAD (3259f), who is strangely unaware of the work of RUNNALLS (3257), seeks to determine, through an analysis of the major speeches of the 'War', the ideas that governed the composition of the work. He devotes chapters to the speeches of Eleazar ben Jair, Agrippa II, and Josephus himself and concludes from them that the ideas that governed the composition of that part of the 'War' were that G-d used the Romans to punish the Jews, that G-d indeed had sponsored the creation and expansion of the Roman Empire, that

G-d had become estranged from the Jews through their internal disunity and through their revolt, that the burning of the Temple was due to the fact that the rebels had polluted it, and that it was the insane character of the revolt that had brought about the Temple's pollution. We may comment that BOMSTAD has thus made of Josephus a kind of forerunner of Augustine's 'City of G-d', whereas the role of theology in Josephus is much reduced. In any case, to generalize as to the motives of Josephus' history from the speeches in the work is dangerous.

## 26.6: Dramatic Elements in Josephus

- (3260) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (3261) GLENN F. CHESTNUT: *The Byzantine Church Historians from Eusebius to Evagrius: A Historiographical Study*. Diss., Oxford University 1971.
- (3262) JOSEPH BLENKINSOPP: *Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, 1974, pp. 239–262.
- (3263) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Josephus as an Apologist to the Greco-Roman World: His Portrait of Solomon*. In: ELISABETH S. FIORENZA, ed., *Aspects of Religious Propaganda in Judaism and Early Christianity*. Notre Dame, Indiana 1976. Pp. 69–98.

THACKERAY (3260), pp. 116–117, has noted that, particularly in Books 15 and 16 of the 'Antiquities', there are a number of distinct verbal echoes of Sophocles, especially of 'Ajax' and 'Electra'.

CHESTNUT (3261), pp. 65ff., has noted that in a broader sense Josephus has incorporated the stock dramatic motif of the change of character which so often accompanies elevation to high office and which, in turn, gives rise to the change of fortune (μεταβολή) which carries the hero to his tragic end.

BLENKINSOPP (3262) remarks that Josephus' version of the death of Ahab (Ant. 8. 409, 418–420) shows his tendency to restate Jewish concepts of divine power and prophetic determination in terms of the classical Greek concepts of fate and tragic destiny as found especially in tragedy. In particular, the extra-Biblical idea of τὸ χρέον ("necessity") entering into the soul of a doomed man through some psychological flaw is closely paralleled in Greek tragedy. Similar cases may be seen in the doom of Saul (Ant. 6. 335) and of Josiah (Ant. 10. 76), as well as of Herod (Ant. 16. 396–404). This, we may comment, would tend to indicate that the Sophoclean elements are not restricted to the books ascribed to the 'Sophoclean' assistant but are indeed found in a number of other books as well.

I (3263) make this same point in my discussion of Josephus' account of Solomon, where I note, in particular, that a number of extra-Biblical elements are introduced which equate Solomon with Oedipus, especially the concept that Solomon was mentally blinded (τῇ διανοίᾳ τετυφλωμένων) as by a riddle (αἰνίγματι) (Ant. 8. 30).

### 26.7: Symbolism, Allegory, and Metaphor in Josephus

- (3264) JEAN PÉPIN: *Mythe et allégorie. Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*. Aubier 1958; 2nd ed., Paris 1976.
- (3265) ROLAND BERGMEIER: *Miszellen zu Flavius Josephus, De Bello Judaico 5, 208 und 236*. In: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 54, 1963, pp. 268–271.
- (3266) VIKTOR PÖSCHL, HELGA GÄRTNER, WALTRAUT HEYKE: *Bibliographie zur antiken Bildersprache*. In their: *Bibliothek der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, N.F. 1. Heidelberg 1964.
- (3266a) RAPHAEL PATAI: *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual*. London 1947; 2nd ed., New York 1967.
- (3266b) ARNO BORST: *Der Turmbau von Babel. Geschichte der Meinungen über Ursprung und Vielfalt der Sprachen und Völker*. 4 vols. Stuttgart 1957–63.
- (3266c) See the Addenda, p. 969.
- (3266d) R. C. MCKELVEY: *The New Temple. The Church in the New Testament* (Oxford Theological Monographs, 3). Oxford 1969.

PÉPIN (3264), pp. 242–244, concludes that Josephus rejects the allegorizing method of philosophy while admitting its application to Scripture. He extends it to the interpretation of dreams and shows Greek influence thereon.

BERGMEIER (3265) notes that the gate of the Temple without a door (War 5. 208) symbolizes heaven, the dwelling-place of G-d which is hidden and not accessible.

PÖSCHL–GÄRTNER–HEYKE (3266), p. 228, present a very brief bibliography on metaphor, allegory, and symbolism in Josephus, but they omit a number of significant items noted above in the discussion of parallels between Philo and Josephus in their allegorical interpretations of the Temple and of its objects.

PATAI (3266a), pp. 112–113, comments on the allegorical significance of the Temple (War 5. 217–218, Ant. 3. 180–187), as compared with its significance in rabbinic literature. He also (p. 117) compares Josephus and the Midrash Tadshe in their symbolic interpretation of the Temple candlestick as planets. He similarly comments (p. 128) on the symbolism of the priestly garments in Josephus and in the Talmud.

BORST (3266b), vol. 1, pp. 170–173, discusses the symbolism, especially numerological and astrological, which influenced Josephus. He notes that Josephus sought through conjecture to emend the obscurities which Philo sought to explain through allegory.

MCKELVEY (3266d), p. 156, remarks that the laver in the Temple was intended to symbolize the great deep (Ant. 8. 79–87) and compares this description with that in the New Testament (Revelation 4. 6).

### 26.8: References to Poetry and to Music

- (3266e) ALFRED SENDREY: *Music in Ancient Israel*. New York 1969. Trans. into German: Leipzig 1970.



SENDREY (3266e), p. 62, comments on Josephus as a source of information about ancient Jewish music. He remarks that Josephus' advantage is that he possessed a close knowledge of many things which he actually described. His weakness is that he indulges almost continuously in glorifying his people. He notes (pp. 242–244) that in characterizing Hebrew poetry Josephus uses terms familiar to his Greek readers, for example, quantitative hexameters, whereas Hebrew poetry is basically accentual. He also notes (pp. 264–266) that, in general, Josephus' descriptions contain some erroneous facts and gross exaggerations, for example, that there were in the Temple orchestra 200,000 silver trumpets and 40,000 harps (Ant. 8. 94). SUNDREY has particular comments on the ten-stringed *kinyra* (Ant. 7. 306), pp. 274–275, and on the manner of playing the *nabla* (*ibid.*), pp. 287–288.

## 26.9: Josephus' Literary Assistants

- (3267) JOHANN AUGUST ERNESTI: *Exercitationes Flavianae*: 2. *Corollarium de stilo Josephi ad scripta Josephi intelligenda et emendanda profuturum*. Leipzig 1758. Republished in his: *Opuscula philologica critica*. Leiden 1776. Pp. 395–407.
- (3268) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967. Chapter 5: *Josephus and Hellenism: His Greek Assistants*, pp. 100–124; trans. into German by JAKOB MITTELMANN in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed., *Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84)*. Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 139–166.
- (3269) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS: *A Lexicon to Josephus*. 4 fascicles. Paris 1930–1955.
- (3270) MOSES HADAS: *A History of Greek Literature*. New York 1950.
- (3271) AVIGDOR TCHERIKOVER, rev.: HENRY ST. J. THACKERAY, *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. In: *Kirjath Sepher* 7, 1930–31, pp. 85–88.
- (3272) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: HENRY ST. J. THACKERAY, *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 90, 1970, pp. 545–546.
- (3273) ELCHANAN STEIN: *De Woordenkeuze in het Bellum Judaicum van Flavius Josephus*. Diss., Leiden. Publ.: Amsterdam 1937.
- (3274) GEORGE C. RICHARDS: *The Composition of Josephus' Antiquities*. In: *Classical Quarterly* 33, 1939, pp. 36–40.
- (3275) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Gießen 1920.
- (3276) SVEN EK: *Herodotismen in der jüdischen Archäologie des Josephos und ihre textkritische Bedeutung*. In: *Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Ventenskapssamfundet i Lund. Acta Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis* 2, Lund 1945–46, pp. 27–62, 213.
- (3277) HORST R. MOEHRING: *Novelistic Elements in the Writings of Flavius Josephus*. Diss., University of Chicago 1957.
- (3278) HORST R. MOEHRING: *The Persecution of the Jews and the Adherents of the Isis Cult at Rome, A.D. 19*. In: *Novum Testamentum* 3, 1959, pp. 293–304.
- (3279) HANS PETERSEN: *Real and Alleged Literary Projects of Josephus*. In: *American Journal of Philology* 79, 1958, pp. 259–274.
- (3280) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Studies in Josephus*. London 1961.
- (3281) SIDNEY MICHAELSON and ANDREW Q. MORTON: *The New Stylometry: A One-Word Test of Authorship for Greek Authors*. In: *Classical Quarterly* 22, 1972, pp. 89–102.

- (3282) ANDREW Q. MORTON and SIDNEY MICHAELSON: Elision as an Indicator of Authorship in Greek Writers. In: *Revue de l'Organisation Internationale pour l'Étude des Langues Anciennes par Ordinateur*, 1973, 3, p. 33–56.
- (3283) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (3283a) YITZHAK BAER: Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.
- (3283b) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: Studies in the Language and Historiography of Flavius Josephus. Diss., Brown University, Providence 1976.

A number of scholars, starting with ERNESTI (3267), had noted that Josephus was deeply indebted, especially in matters of style, to certain Greek authors, notably Thucydides. Josephus himself (*Against Apion* 1. 50) says that he employed assistants for the sake of the Greek of the 'War'. He says nothing about the 'Antiquities', however; and it was THACKERAY (3268), pp. 107–118, who, on the basis of a close study of Josephus' vocabulary and style, theorized that in Books 15 and 16 he utilized an assistant who had a particular love of Greek poetry, especially Sophocles, and in Books 17–19 an assistant who was particularly fond of Thucydides. THACKERAY and MARCUS' (3269) lexicon, in support of this theory, employs various symbols to indicate Sophoclean and Thucydidean words.

HADAS (3270), pp. 237–239, accepts THACKERAY's suggestion, but TCHERIKOVER (3271) rejects the theory that the assistants did the writing and that Josephus merely exercised general supervision, and suggests that Josephus did the writing and that the assistants merely corrected the style.

I (3272), in response to this 'higher' criticism of Josephus, have called attention to the following: 1) Josephus' statement (*Against Apion* 1. 50) that he used fellow-workers for the sake of the Greek occurs in his discussion of the composition of the 'War', where THACKERAY (3268), p. 106, ironically is forced to admit that he cannot pinpoint the nature and extent of their help, though, of course, we may add, it was not uncommon in antiquity for an author to indicate a source where he employed none and to fail to indicate it where he did use it; 2) There are Sophoclean and Thucydidean traces throughout the 'War' and the 'Antiquities', as STEIN (3273) has shown; 3) The presence of many of the Sophoclean and Thucydidean phrases in the other Greek works of the period, notably Dionysius of Halicarnassus, shows that they are characteristic of first-century Greek rather than that they are the work of a special assistant; 4) The fact that Josephus used Strabo in Books 13–15 shows that there is not a sharp dividing line, as THACKERAY contends, between Josephus' work ending in Book 14 and the assistant's work commencing in Book 15; 5) If Josephus used an assistant for the 'Antiquities', we would have expected him to use one for 'Against Apion', which, by THACKERAY's own admission, shows great literary skill, but for the writing of which he postulates no assistant; 6) The 'Antiquities' was written after Josephus had been in Rome for twenty years. If he had had any contact with the Jews of Rome, it must have been in Greek, to judge from the inscriptions of the Jewish catacombs. Hence he had hardly the same

need for assistants for the 'Antiquities' as for the 'War'. Most likely Josephus himself was at that time making a special study of Thucydides, for example, and hence the Thucydidean phraseology. To this we may add that the Sophoclean element in Books 15 and 16 may be due to Herod's secretary Nicolaus of Damascus, who was steeped in Sophocles and who was Josephus' chief source for Herod in Books 14–17.

RICHARDS (3274), following LAQUEUR (3275), suggests that Josephus, in answer to the attacks on his style and credibility by Justus of Tiberias, prepared a second edition of the 'Antiquities'. It is at this stage that the assistants may have been called in, he suggests; or it may have been Josephus himself who adopted classical models in his revision of the text.

EK (3276) finds Herodotean phrases throughout the 'Antiquities', and concludes that it is Josephus himself rather than an assistant who was attempting to follow classical models.

MOEHRING (3277) generally supports THACKERAY's theory, and concludes that the Thucydidean 'hack', who, according to THACKERAY, assisted Josephus in the completion of 'Antiquities' Books 17–19, avoided erotic elements (as seen in his omission of them from his account of the Jewish sects in Antiquities 18. 11–25), and that it was Josephus who introduced such matter (as seen from his account of the sects in War 2. 119–166); but, we may reply, this thesis may well be questioned, since the same Thucydidean assistant presented, by MOEHRING's own admission, a highly erotic account in Antiquities 18. 66–80. MOEHRING, however, does assert that THACKERAY has gone too far in assigning whole books to the assistant. Rather, according to MOEHRING, the assistants helped Josephus in matters of style only; the fact that the same novelistic elements are found throughout his work indicates that Josephus was responsible for the subject-matter.

MOEHRING (3278), in a rather superficial study of the accounts of Paulina (Ant. 18. 66–80) and of the expulsion of the Jews from Rome (Ant. 18. 81–84), notes, though without a real study of the Hellenistic historians, the elements of Hellenistic romance in the former passage and the elements of Thucydidean style in both.

PETERSEN (3279), p. 261, argues cogently against THACKERAY's hypothesis, noting that many Thucydidean reminiscences are found in the earlier books of the 'Antiquities', and that we can account for the greater preponderance of Thucydidean phrases in Books 17–19 by assuming that Josephus was, while writing these books, making an intensive study of Thucydides to improve his style.

SHUTT (3280) explains the Sophoclean diction of 'Antiquities' 15–16, as well as the Thucydidean ring of 'Antiquities' 17–19, as due to a growing familiarity with the Greek language rather than to the skilled collaborators suggested by THACKERAY; but, we may reply, if so, how can we explain the non-Sophoclean and non-Thucydidean ring of Book 20 of the 'Antiquities', as well as of 'Against Apion', written at about the same time? SHUTT argues that the stylistic homogeneity throughout the 'War' and the stylistic similarities between the 'War' and the 'Antiquities' refute THACKERAY's contention that the hand of his

assistants is more apparent in the earlier books of the 'War' than in the later ones. SHUTT's conclusion as to the homogeneity of the 'War' and of the similarities between the 'War' and his other works is supported by MICHAELSON and MORTON's (3281) study concluding that there is no statistically significant difference in the occurrence of the genitive of αὐτός in the first book of the 'War', the fifth book of the 'War', the 'Life', and the second book of 'Against Apion'.

MORTON and MICHAELSON's (3282) study of elision, however, would seem to support the view that the hand that polished the 'War' was not at work on the 'Antiquities'. SHUTT maintains that, contrary to THACKERAY, Josephus' assistants in the 'War' merely polished his translation from the original Aramaic, and that he had no need to employ assistants when he wrote the 'Antiquities' twenty years later. He properly concludes that we must allow for development in Josephus' knowledge of Greek, though we must note that the Greek in the 'War' is much superior to that in the 'Antiquities'.

SCHRECKENBERG (3283), p. 86, argues that, in the light of the new concordance of Josephus, there is a relatively unified picture of stylistic particulars which also includes the 'War', although it does have some peculiarities of diction. He concludes that Josephus supervised the assistants and made their changes his own.

BAER (3283a) attributes, though without proof, to the assistants much more than merely improving Josephus' style and thinks that they actually rewrote Josephus' basic account.

LADOUCEUR (3283b) concludes that the lexical evidence does not support THACKERAY's theory of assistants, since the words which THACKERAY regards as particularly indicative of a Sophoclean or of a Thucydidean assistant occur throughout the 'Antiquities'. From the fourth century onwards words previously found in tragedy, in Ionic prose, and in Thucydides begin to appear in non-literary documents, papyri, and inscriptions. Moreover, Josephus frequently uses these words not in their classical sense but in the meaning that they had attained in the first century C.E.

## 26.10: Josephus' Grammar

- (3284) ROBERT HELBING: Die Präpositionen bei Herodot und anderen Historikern (= Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache 16, 1904). Würzburg 1904.
- (3285) GUILIELMUS SCHMIDT: De Flavii Josephi elocutione observationes criticae. Pars prior. Diss., Göttingen. Publ.: Leipzig 1893. Published in fuller form in: Jahrbücher für classische Philologie, Supplement 20, Leipzig 1894, pp. 341–550.
- (3286) JERKER BLOMQUIST: Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose. Lund 1969.
- (3287) JULIUS R. MANTEY: The Causal Use of *Eis* in the New Testament. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 70, 1951, pp. 45–48.
- (3288) RALPH MARCUS: On Causal *Eis*. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 70, 1951, pp. 129–130.
- (3289) JULIUS R. MANTEY: On Causal *Eis* Again. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 70, 1951, pp. 309–311.
- (3290) RALPH MARCUS: The Elusive Causal *Eis*. In: Journal of Biblical Literature 71, 1952, pp. 43–44.

- (3291) DOUGLAS B. GREGOR: The Aorist in μή Clauses. In: *Classical Review* 4, 1957, p. 97.  
 (3291a) LARS RYDBECK: Fachprosa, vermeintliche Volkssprache und Neues Testament. Zur Beurteilung der sprachlichen Niveauunterschiede im nachklassischen Griechisch. Uppsala 1967.

There have been few systematic studies of any portion of Josephus' grammar, such as that of HELBING (3284), comparing Josephus' use of various prepositions and frequency of cases following each of them with those of fourteen other Greek historians. The single comprehensive study remains that of SCHMIDT (3285). It is disappointing that BLOMQUIST (3286), in a work dealing with the meaning, position, and frequency of particles in Hellenistic prose, omits all reference to Josephus.

MANTEY (3287) cites Antiquities 9. 32 as an example of causal εἰς. MARCUS (3288) rightly objects and here translates εἰς in the sense of place to which. MANTEY (3289) concludes that in some contexts final cause and purpose are almost the same thing. MARCUS (3290) shows that in the examples from non-Biblical Greek cited by MANTEY εἰς does not mean "because of".

GREGOR (3291) cites War 1. 564 as an example of the aorist optative introduced by μή to express fear concerning the past.

RYDBECK (3291a) comments on Josephus' use of παραπλήσιος with the genitive instead of with the dative (p. 49: War 6. 388); the construction of the prepositions πρό, μετά, ἀπό (pp. 67–68: Ant. 15. 408, 18. 94, 18. 249); the double genitive and ἥ construction and the uses of πρό and of μετά (p. 73: Ant. 14. 317; Ant. 2. 318, 13. 46, 18. 307); the use of ὅστις ἂν and ἐάν, which are equated, and of ἐάν as a conditional conjunction (p. 141: Ant. 5. 25). RYDBECK concludes that Josephus' work is motley in language and style.

## 26.11: Hebrew as Josephus' Ancestral Language

- (3291b) H. OTT: Um die Muttersprache Jesu. Forschungen seit Gustaf Dalman. In: *Novum Testamentum* 9, 1967, pp. 1–25.  
 (3291c) PINCHAS LAPIDE: Insights from Qumran into the Languages of Jesus. In: *Revue de Qumran* 8, 1972–75, pp. 483–501.  
 (3291d) TESSA RAJAK: *Flavius Josephus: Jewish History and the Greek World*. Diss., 2 vols., Oxford 1974.

OTT (3291 b) says that the equation of ἑβραϊστί = Aramaic can no longer be held, since Aramaic in the Septuagint and in Josephus (Ant. 12. 15) is συριστί. Josephus, he asserts, differentiates Hebrew from Aramaic clearly (Ant. 10. 8, 12. 15) and notes Babylonian-Aramaic loan-words as such (Ant. 3. 156). It is more often Hebrew rather than Aramaic words that lie behind Josephus' Greek text. Such Aramaic words as *Asartha* (Ant. 3, 252) and *Pascha* (Ant. 2. 313, 3. 248) in Josephus are not a refutation because of the confusion of the two languages. As in the Talmud, so in Josephus, Hebrew actually means Hebrew (War 6. 96). Hence Hebrew was more probably the spoken language of Jerusalem in Josephus' day. We may reply that the incidence of Aramaic words in the Gospels and the reference (War 1. 3) to the composition of the 'War' originally

in Aramaic for the sake of the people of the upper country, that is, Babylonia, where Aramaic rather than Hebrew was spoken, argue to the contrary.

LAPIDE (3291c) similarly asserts that when Josephus speaks of his ancestral language he means Hebrew, though he admits that there is an occasional slip of the pen, as in *Antiquities* 3. 252, where he asserts that Asartha (= 'Azartha) means Pentecost in the language of the Hebrews. We may comment that at this time Hebrew had a number of Aramaic words and vice versa, so that the mention of an Aramaic word as Hebrew is hardly a conclusive argument. Moreover, Josephus here speaks of the language of the Hebrews, rather than of Hebrew, and this is not inconsistent with identifying the language as Aramaic.

I have not seen Appendix I of RAJAK (3291d), which discusses the question as to what was the native language of Josephus.

## 26.12: Aramaisms in the 'War'

- (3292) ALBERT T. OLMSTEAD: Could an Aramaic Gospel Be Written? In: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 1, 1942, pp. 41–75.
- (3293) EDGAR J. GOODSPEED: The Possible Aramaic Gospel. In: *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 1, 1942, pp. 315–340.
- (3293a) JEHOShUA M. GRINTZ: Hebrew as Literary and Spoken Language in the Days of the Second Temple (according to Sources in Greek) (in Hebrew). *Eshkoloth* (Scholia) 3, 1959, pp. 125–144.
- (3294) JEHOShUA M. GRINTZ: Hebrew as the Spoken and Written Language in the Last Days of the Second Temple. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79, 1960, pp. 32–47.
- (3295) JEHOShUA M. GRINTZ: Chapters in the History of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1969.
- (3296) OTTO MICHEL: Zur Arbeit an den Textzeugen des Josephus. In: *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 83, 1971, pp. 101–102.
- (3297) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews'. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 4, 1965, pp. 163–188. Trans. into German by JAKOB MITTELMANN in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, *Zur Josephus-Forschung* (Wege der Forschung, 84). Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 367–400.
- (3298) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (3298a) GOHEI HATA: Is the Greek Version of Josephus' *Jewish War* a Translation or a Re-writing of the First Version? In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 66, 1975–76, pp. 89–108.

Inasmuch as Aramaic was apparently Josephus' native tongue and, indeed, the language in which he first composed the 'War', we should expect some Aramaisms in his Greek. And yet, few scholars have been able to detect them, especially in the 'War', which was, it seems, so carefully corrected (or written) by his assistants that the evidence has been removed.

OLMSTEAD (3292) says that μεταβαλὼν in War 1. 3, with reference to the translation of the 'War' from Aramaic into Greek, implies that the Greek was not a translation but a revised second edition. In reply we may note that in *Antiquities* 1. 10 the same verb, referring to the translation of the Torah into Greek, clearly means "translate", since Josephus says (*Antiquities* 1. 17 and elsewhere) that he has neither added to nor subtracted anything from the original.

GOODSPEED (3293) expresses doubt about Josephus' statement that he first wrote the 'War' in Aramaic and afterwards translated it into Greek and suggests that perhaps Josephus sent a first draft of a shorter version in Aramaic to the Jews of the Upper Country. He asks why Aramaic Judea allowed Josephus' work in Aramaic to disappear and concludes that up until 50 C.E. no one had ever written a book in Aramaic. Finally, he says that if Josephus could have been so loose in the 'Antiquities' in translating a sacred book, the Bible, despite protestations of absolute fidelity, how much freer he must have been in translating a work that was not sacred. We may respond that the statement that no one until 50 had ever composed a work in Aramaic is unlikely in view of the fact that considerable portions of the Books of Daniel (2. 4–7. 28) and Ezra (4. 8–6. 8 and 7. 12–26) are in Aramaic. Moreover, among the Dead Sea Scrolls there are texts and fragments in Aramaic, notably the Genesis Apocryphon, which dates from before this period. As to why Aramaic Judea allowed the Aramaic version of the 'War' to disappear, Josephus' traitorous activities may have been sufficient to account for this; and, in any case, the great majority of the literature of this period is lost.

GRINTZ (3293a)(3294) contends that where Josephus gives Hebrew words the Aramaic equivalents are different, and that the first edition of the 'War' was consequently written in Hebrew rather than in Aramaic. GRINTZ' Hebrew version, we may note, contains a further elucidation of certain points in the English version. GRINTZ (3295), pp. 95–98, repeats his remarks and adds that "Hebrew" in Josephus' writings always denotes Hebrew and never Aramaic. We may reply that no one, of course, doubts that Josephus knew Hebrew; but the widespread use by the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews of the Targumim, the Aramaic versions of the Bible, shows that Aramaic was the language of the masses; and it seems more likely that Josephus would have used this language in addressing them. Moreover, the barbarians of the upper country (τοις ἄνω βαρβάρους, War 1. 3), to whom he sent the version, are clearly those dwelling in Parthia, Babylonia, and Adiabene, where Aramaic rather than Hebrew was spoken. Finally, in War 1. 3 Josephus says that he wrote in his ancestral (τῇ πατρίῳ) tongue and does not specify Hebrew; he presumably means the language spoken by his father and grandfather in his household.

MICHEL (3296) suggests that the work that SCHALIT (3297) has done in seeking Aramaisms in the 'Antiquities' should be extended to the 'War' and comments particularly on War 1. 3, 1. 37, and 1. 65. The problem, he says, is whether this Semitic influence goes back to an older transmission or is secondary. SCHRECKENBERG (3298), in reply, declares that, from the point of view of the text tradition, the hypothesis, tentatively advanced by MICHEL, that Josephus issued various editions is unfounded.

HATA (3298a), without realizing that the suggestion had been made previously by OLMSTEAD (3292), has revived the idea that μεταβαλὼν in War 1. 3 means not "translate" but "rewrite". He correctly argues that in Greek and Hellenistic literature the use of the verb in the sense of "translate" is rare, that the 'War' can hardly be a translation from a Semitic original, since it has a complete lack of Semitic phraseology, and that the Greek version was made in

accordance with the traditional and conventional methods of Greek and Hellenistic historical writing. We may respond that while it is true that μεταβάλλω in Greek normally means “to change” rather than “to translate”, it is clear that both in Antiquities 1. 10 and in Antiquities 12. 107 the reference is to the translation of the Torah into Greek as commissioned by Ptolemy Philadelphus and known as the Septuagint, and that Josephus uses the term interchangeably in both contexts with the more usual words μεθερμηνεύω (Ant. 1. 5) and ἐρμηνεία (Ant. 12. 107). Moreover, as MICHEL (3296) indicates, it is unwarranted to speak of a complete lack of Semiticisms in the ‘War’. We may, however, call attention to the fact that Josephus himself admits (‘Against Apion’ 1. 50) that he employed some assistants for the sake of the Greek when he composed his ‘War’; and it was they, presumably, who imposed upon the work the stamp of the typical Hellenistic historiographical devices described by HATA. We may further surmise that inasmuch as Josephus in the ‘Antiquities’ says that his work has been translated (μεθιερμηνευμένην) from the Hebrew records and that he has neither added nor omitted anything (Ant. 1. 17), whereas actually he makes considerable changes, similarly in rendering the ‘War’ into Greek he also had had a rather free conception of the art of translation.

### 26.13: Aramaic Sources for the ‘Antiquities’

- (3299) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed. and trans.: Josephus, Antiquitates Judaicae (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Jerusalem 1944.
- (3300) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His *Vita* and Development as a Historian. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (3301) ROSE-MARIE SEYBERLICH: Esther in der Septuaginta und bei Flavius Josephus. In: CHARLOTTE WELSKOPF, ed., Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt, Band 1: Alter Orient und Griechenland (= II. Internationale Tagung der Fachgruppe Alte Geschichte der Deutschen Historiker-Gesellschaft vom 4.–8. Sept. 1962 in Stralsund). Berlin 1964. Pp. 363–366.
- (3302) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus’ ‘Antiquities of the Jews’. In: Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 4, 1965, pp. 163–188. Trans. into German by JAKOB MITTELMANN in: ABRAHAM SCHALIT, Zur Josephus-Forschung (Wege der Forschung, 84). Darmstadt 1973. Pp. 367–400.
- (3303) NAOMI G. COHEN: Asinaeus and Anilaus: Additional Comments to Josephus’ Antiquities of the Jews. In: Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 10, 1975–76, pp. 30–37.
- (3304) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965.
- (3305) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Josephus Flavius. In: Encyclopaedia Judaica 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (3306) ROGER LE DÉAUT: Introduction à la Littérature targumique. Part 1. Rome 1966.
- (3307) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Σαββατα: Transcription grecque de l’Araméen. In: Vetus Testamentum 22, 1972, pp. 436–447.
- (3307a) ISIAH GAFNI: The Conversion of the Kings of Adiabene in the Light of Talmudic Literature (in Hebrew). In: Niv HaMidrashiah 1971, pp. 204–212.



SCHALIT (3299), pp. xxvii–xxxv, offers a number of proofs that Josephus used an Aramaic Targum while composing his ‘Antiquities’. COHEN (3300) objects that Josephus’ transliterations from Aramaic show only that he spoke Aramaic, and not necessarily that he used a Targum; but, if so, we may ask, why do these transliterations from Aramaic appear in some places but not in others?

SEYBERLICH (3301), commenting on the fact that the second edict of King Ahasuerus is found only in Josephus (Ant. 11. 273–283) and in the Aramaic Targum Sheni 8. 12, considers the possibility that Josephus’ source may have been an Aramaic Targum-like paraphrase, but dismisses this by noting that since Josephus, at the time of the completion of the ‘Antiquities’, had spent twenty years in Rome, it is improbable that he used an Aramaic Targum and more probable that he merely recalled some details of Pharisaic midrashim that he had heard in his earlier years. We may comment that actually the text of the edict in Josephus is a close paraphrase of Addition E of the Septuagint; and, in any case, in view of the continuing contacts between the Jewish communities of the land of Israel and of Rome throughout this period, it is not unlikely that Josephus would have access to an Aramaic Targum.

SCHALIT (3302), as we have noted above, convincingly solves the problem of the meaning of *κτελλίων* (or *κτελίων*) in Antiquities 18. 343 by suggesting that it is an Aramaic word *ketila*, ‘slain’, and that the familiar Aramaic formula *gavra ketila* has been abridged in a manner characteristic of a popular way of speaking, though, we may add, it is possible that this particular phrase, a technical one, was used as such in Josephus’ source. He consequently suggests that Josephus’ source for the story of the two Jewish brothers Asinaeus and Anilaeus who established a quasi-independent state in Babylonia was in Aramaic, the mother-tongue of the Jews of the region. In Izates’ prayer (Ant. 20. 90), SCHALIT notes that the word *μεγαλορρημονα*, ‘grandiloquent’, which is found in the *editio princeps*, though not in any of our manuscripts, occurs in Daniel 7. 8 and 20, the original of which is in Aramaic, and suggests that it was an integral part of Izates’ prayer, which was originally composed in Aramaic, his mother-tongue, and that, in fact, Josephus’ source for the whole story of the conversion of Izates (Ant. 20. 17–96) was in Aramaic. We may respond, as we have suggested above, that inasmuch Josephus does not use the Aramaic word, it is also possible that Josephus used the Septuagint version of Daniel at this point.

COHEN (3303) provides further evidence for SCHALIT’s theory of an Aramaic source, at second-hand, for this part of the ‘Antiquities’ by noting that the reference to the weaving trade taught to Asinaeus and Anilaeus (Ant. 18. 314) is actually to the manufacture of scale armor of the Parthian *Cata-phractarii*, if we understand that Josephus has mistranslated the Aramaic homonym. We may comment, however, that Josephus specifically adds that it was not considered undignified by the inhabitants of Babylonia to spin wool, and this is to be understood in the light of the Mishnah ‘Eduyyot 1. 3, which states that there is no craft lower than that of a weaver; cf. Baba Bathra 21a and my note (3304), pp. 181–183, on Ant. 18. 314. Hence the traditional rendering of this passage seems more likely.

SCHALIT (3305), p. 258, even goes so far as to state that “it is reasonable to assume” that Josephus’ original draft of the ‘Antiquities’ was in Aramaic, and that assistants helped him to give it a Greek garb worthy of the name. We may respond that Josephus nowhere states that he employed assistants in composing the ‘Antiquities’; and in view of the fact that stylistically it is far inferior to the ‘War’, which he composed twenty years earlier with the help of assistants, it seems likely that the decline in literary standards is due to the fact that he did not receive aid. Whatever few Aramaisms there are may be explained either as due to technical terms or due to the fact Aramaic was his native language and inevitably, if unwittingly, influenced his style.

LE DÉAUT (3306), pp. 56–58, is certain that Josephus used some sort of Aramaic version of the Pentateuch and suggests that it was a written Targum of Midrashic tendencies, practically identical with the traditional Targum of Jonathan.

PELLETIER (3307) notes that Josephus calls the Sabbath (Ant. 1. 33) Σάββατα, which is Aramaic in form; but the use of Σάββατα in the Septuagint shows that the word was given a Greek ending by the translator (unless, we may add, we adopt the view of the sixteenth-century AZARIAH DEI ROSSI that the Septuagint was made from an Aramaic paraphrase).

GAFNI (3307a) comments on the Aramaic source for Josephus’ account of the Jews of Babylonia. In particular, he considers SCHALIT’s (3302) hypothesis of an Aramaic source for Izates’ prayer (Ant. 20. 90) and notes that the word σαμψηρά is either Aramaic or perhaps Parthian *safsira*.

## 26.14: Josephus’ Knowledge of Latin (see also 26.4)

(3307b) DAVID DAUBE: Three Legal Notes on Josephus after His Surrender. In: Law Quarterly Review (London) 93, 1977, pp. 191–194.

DAUBE (3307b) notes that κелеύσαντος (Life 414) is a Latinism, being used in the sense of *iubeo*, “to authorize”. Since the word is used in connection with Vespasian’s authorization that Josephus marry one of the women taken captive at Caesarea, DAUBE conjectures that Josephus heard the Latin at that time in that sense and that it stuck in his mind. We may comment that inasmuch as he wrote the ‘Life’ at least twenty-six years after this event it seems unlikely that a single word in a strange language would have remained in his mind for so long. Moreover, Josephus is here trying to justify his marriage to a captive woman, since, as a priest, he was prohibited by Jewish law from doing so; hence it makes better sense to say that Josephus, in his defense, insisted that he did so only because Vespasian had ordered him to marry her.

## 26.15: The Alleged Second Edition of the 'Antiquities'

- (3308) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus*. Gießen 1920.
- (3309) ROBERT EISLER: *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (3310) HANS LEWY, rev.: ROBERT EISLER, *IHCOUS BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*. In: *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 51, 1930, pp. 481–494.
- (3311) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes*. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (3312) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*. Leiden 1972.
- (3313) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (3314) HILARIUS EMONDS: *Zweite Auflage im Altertum; kulturgeschichtliche Studien zur Überlieferung der antiken Literatur*. Leipzig 1941. Issued in part as Diss., Bonn 1937: *Zweite Auflagen im Altertum und ihr Erscheinen im Variantenbestand handschriftlicher Überlieferung*.
- (3314a) DAVID A. BARISH: *The Autobiography of Josephus and the Hypothesis of a Second Edition of His Antiquities*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 71, 1978, pp. 61–75.
- (3314b) DAVID ALTSHULER: *The Treatise ΠΕΡΙ ΕΘΩΝ ΚΑΙ ΑΙΤΙΩΝ 'On Customs and Causes' by Flavius Josephus*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 69, 1978–79, pp. 226–232.

LAQUEUR (3308) presents the suggestion that Josephus' 'Antiquities' appeared in more than one edition. This view is endorsed by EISLER (3309) but rejected by LEWY (3310).

SCHRECKENBERG (3311), p. 87 n., (3312), pp. 63 and 176–177, rejects this view because our Josephus manuscripts appear to be descended from one archetype rather than from two. The studies of the text of Josephus as transmitted by the Church Fathers support the view that the polarization of the two text families from the third century onwards must be attributed to a different choice of alternate readings rather than to two different editions. But, as COHEN (3313) has properly remarked, this means only that our manuscript tradition, which, as we have noted, is quite late, provides no proof for a second edition, not that it provides evidence against it. Moreover, as EMONDS (3314), in a work that curiously has no reference to the alleged second edition of Josephus, has remarked, ancient book production afforded ample opportunity for change and corrections. On the other hand, the absence of any specific reference in Josephus to a second edition would place the burden of proof on those who argue that there was one.

BARISH (3314a) argues against LAQUEUR's (3308) hypothesis of a second edition by noting the structural parallel between *Antiquities* 20. 266–267 (according to LAQUEUR, 266 is part of the second edition, whereas 267 is part of the first edition) and *Life* 430. He also notes that Josephus is characteristically redundant and hence might well have repeated his intention to conclude his narrative.

ALTSHULER (3314b) notes that whereas in *Antiquities* 3. 94, 205, and 218, Josephus explicitly claims that he is not going to discuss the laws of *Leviticus* and *Numbers* here in the 'Antiquities', yet that is precisely what he does in 3. 224–286 and 4. 67–75. There are even statements that come after *Antiquities*

4. 75 but suggest that Josephus had not yet written about the laws of Leviticus and Numbers, namely 4. 198. In addition, Antiquities 4. 302 is contradicted by 3. 286. He concludes that Antiquities 3. 224–286 and possibly 4. 67–75 are later insertions by Josephus. We may comment that there is no necessary contradiction between Antiquities 4. 302 and 3. 286; in the latter passage he does not state that he has not described the laws, but merely indicates that he intends to do so, presumably at further length and from the point of view of the reasons for the commandments, in a future work.

## 27: Josephus' Influence until the Twentieth Century

### 27.0: Josephus' Influence: General

- (3315) SIGEBERTUS (SYVERT) HAVERCAMP: *Flavii Josephi Opera*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam 1726.
- (3316) ROBERT EISLER: *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (3317) EVA M. SANFORD: Propaganda and Censorship in the Transmission of Josephus. In: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 66, 1935, pp. 127–145.
- (3318) KURT WEITZMANN: Zur Frage des Einflusses jüdischer Bilderquellen auf die Illustration des Alten Testaments. In: *Mullus. Festschrift Theodor Klauser*. Münster 1964. Pp. 401–415.
- (3319) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*. Leiden 1972.

It is still worthwhile to consult HAVERCAMP's (3315) twenty-one-page list of testimonia in Josephus' favor by writers up to the tenth century.

EISLER (3316), pp. xxxv–xlix, has a considerable treatment of the *Fortleben* of Josephus, notably of translations of Josephus and of Josippon.

SANFORD (3317) has presented a skimpy overall survey of the transmission of the text and of the versions of Josephus, with particular concern for interpolations and modifications of the text intended to convert Jews to Christianity or to convert Christians to a modified Judaism.

WEITZMANN (3318) expresses the belief, though without evidence, that illuminated manuscripts of Josephus' historical works circulated in Jewish groups in late antiquity. We may comment that such a view is unlikely because of the bitter attitude toward Josephus in Jewish circles. WEITZMANN, however, pp. 410–411, cannot be disputed when he shows that Josephus' word ἀνεσταύρωσε, which is found in Josephus and not in the Septuagint, is the source of the medieval depiction of the crucifixion of the chief baker (Gen. 40. 22; Josephus, Ant. 2. 73). Apparently, among Christians there is a long and widespread tradition behind illustrating Josephus, especially in the 'Antiquities'.

SCHRECKENBERG (3319) has a systematic, critical presentation of the transmission of the text of Josephus from the autograph to the *editio princeps*. He documents the constant interpolation, revision, and censorship in the transmission of the text by Christians in the interest of particular religious and political views. As a preliminary to a new critical edition of Josephus, SCHRECKENBERG presents a list of citations in all ancient and medieval authors who translated, excerpted, cited, or alluded to Josephus. One can thereby trace the rise and fall in popularity of certain portions of Josephus: thus, for example, we find

that during the period of the Crusades the geographical and topographical portions were particularly consulted.

### 27.1: Parallels between Josephus and the Talmud

- (3319a) DIETRICH RÖSSLER: Gesetz und Geschichte. Untersuchungen zur Theologie der jüdischen Apokalyptik und der pharisäischen Orthodoxie (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, 3). Neukirchen 1960; 2nd ed. 1962.
- (3319b) JACOB NEUSNER: The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70. 3 vols. Leiden 1971.
- (3319c) SHELDON R. ISENBERG: Power through Temple and Torah in Greco-Roman Palestine. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty. Vol. 2, Leiden 1975, pp. 24–52.
- (3319d) GEORGE W. BUCHANAN: The Use of Rabbinic Literature for New Testament Research. In: Biblical Theology Bulletin 7, 1977, pp. 110–122.

RÖSSLER (3319a), p. 21, notes the lack of history in rabbinic writings in contrast to Josephus and speculates on the reasons for this.

NEUSNER (3319b), vol. 1, pp. 58–59, comments on the parallel between Antiquities 13.282 and the voice that came to Johanan the High Priest (John Hyrcanus) in the Talmud (Sotah 33a). NEUSNER, vol. 1, pp. 387–388, notes that Josephus' portrait of Simeon ben Gamaliel in general conforms to the rabbinic picture, but that in details they do not relate to each other in that the Simeon of the Talmud is a legal authority, whereas in Josephus he is a politician. We may, however, comment that the explanation of this is that the Talmud is a legal work, whereas Josephus is a historian, stressing political events.

ISENBERG (3319c) pp. 36–42, agrees with NEUSNER (3319b) that the evidence from Josephus concerning the history of the Pharisees does not necessarily contradict the rabbinic materials. In comparing Josephus (Ant. 13.288–298) and the Talmud (Kiddushin 66a) Isenberg concludes that though the details differ, Josephus and the rabbis have a solid shared tradition which connects their accounts with the Oral Law and for which the *terminus ante quem* is Josephus.

BUCHANAN (3319d) notes that in some cases it is possible to date rabbinic materials by parallel traditions in Josephus. Thus he asserts that the fact that the traditional story of the announcement to Pharaoh of the birth of Moses is also found in Antiquities 2.205–209 indicates that one form of the narrative was circulated early enough to allow the possibility that this tradition was known by the author of the Gospel of Matthew and was influential in providing inspiration for details used in the composition of the birth narrative of Jesus.

### 27.2: Josephus and Tacitus

- (3320) WILHELM WEBER: Josephus und Vespasian. Untersuchungen zu dem jüdischen Krieg des Flavius Josephus. Stuttgart 1921.

- (3321) SALOMO RAPPAPORT: Antikes zur Bibel und Agada. In: Festschrift Armand Kaminka zum siebzigsten Geburtstage. Wien 1937. Pp. 71–101.
- (3322) NEILSON C. DEBEVOISE: A Political History of Parthia. Chicago 1938.
- (3323) WERNER SCHUR: Parthia. In: AUGUST PAULY and GEORG WISSOWA, edd., Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 18. 3, 1949, cols. 1968–2029.
- (3324) ANNA M. A. HOSPERS-JANSEN: Tacitus over de Joden: Hist. 5, 2–13. Groningen 1949.
- (3325) ADALBERT BRIESSMANN: Tacitus und das Flavische Geschichtsbild (Hermes Einzel-schriften, 10). Wiesbaden 1955.
- (3326) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter. Leiden 1972.
- (3327) MOSES ABERBACH: The Conflicting Accounts of Josephus and Tacitus Concerning Cumanus' and Felix' Terms of Office. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 40, 1949–50, pp. 1–14.
- (3328) EDITH MARY SMALLWOOD: Some Comments on Tacitus, Annals XII, 54. In: Latomus 18, 1959, pp. 560–567.
- (3329) CHARLES SAUMAGNE: Saint Paul et Félix, procureur de Judée. In: RAYMOND CHEVALLIER, ed., Mélanges André Piganiol 3, Paris 1966, pp. 1373–1386.
- (3330) D. B. SADDINGTON: The Roman *Auxilia* in Tacitus, Josephus and Other Early Imperial Writers. In: Acta Classica 13, 1970, pp. 89–124.
- (3331) YITZHAK BAER: Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction (in Hebrew). In: Zion 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.

Since Tacitus is the somewhat later contemporary of Josephus (his 'Histories', which covered the events of 69–96, was issued about 104–109, and the 'Annals' about 115–117, whereas Josephus' 'War' dates from 75–79, and the 'Antiquities' from 93–94) and parallels him in a number of points, particularly in the account of the 'Jewish War', a number of scholars have considered whether Tacitus used Josephus as a source. WEBER (3320), pp. 50, 103, concludes that Tacitus did not use the 'War' but that both had a common source.

RAPPAPORT (3321), pp. 87–91, comparing the accounts of Tacitus (Histories 5. 13) and Josephus (War 6. 300ff.) of the prodigies that accompanied the destruction of the Temple, argues that there was no influence of one upon the other, since the motifs are frequent in ancient pagan and Jewish Hellenistic literature generally.

At a number of points in the later books of the 'Antiquities' Josephus and Tacitus parallel each other in their accounts of Parthian affairs. DEBEVOISE (3322) argues that Josephus must regularly be preferred to Tacitus, who is here, he says, as confused as he is exact for the events at Rome. SCHUR (3323), especially pp. 2010–2011, on the other hand, follows Tacitus, especially when supported by numismatic evidence, against Josephus.

HOSPERS-JANSEN (3324) maintains that Josephus was only a "Jewish historian" and thus not accessible to Tacitus, though she is forced to concede that Josephus was an officially recognized author in educated Roman circles. Moreover, Tacitus, as an orator, apparently knew the writings of the grammarian Apion and of the historian Lysimachus, whose account of the origin of the Jews as lepers is closely followed by Tacitus (Histories 5. 3). We may, however,

suggest that perhaps because Josephus was in favor with Domitian, whom Tacitus despised because of his treatment of his father-in-law Agricola, he may have detested Josephus.

BRIESSMANN (3325) asserts that there are a number of phrases in the 'War' which are closely paralleled in Tacitus and in Dio. For example, War 4. 602 is paralleled by Tacitus, *Histories* 2. 74 and Dio 65. 8. 3a in their accounts of Vespasian's hesitation to seek the throne. Similarly War 4. 697 is paralleled by Tacitus, *Histories* 2. 5. BRIESSMANN explains these similarities by postulating a common source, either Pliny or Cluvius Rufus. We may comment that there is, to be sure, a close resemblance between Pliny (*Naturalis Historia* 7. 65), Tacitus (*Hist.* 5. 6) and Josephus (War 4. 476–485) in their descriptions of the Dead Sea; and it is, indeed, interesting that Tacitus states that he has compared both the detailed accounts given by earlier writers (presumably Pliny would be one of these), as well as the narratives of those who knew the locality personally. Inasmuch, however, as Cluvius' account is lost, the matter, we may comment, cannot be proved; but it seems unlikely that Josephus possessed a sufficient knowledge of Latin to make good use of Pliny and Cluvius, though, as we have noted above, some have argued that he was influenced stylistically by Sallust. If a common source is sought, we may here suggest the memoirs of Vespasian (*Life* 342) or those of Titus (*Life* 358), which Josephus at least does cite.

SCHRECKENBERG (3326), p. 69, suggests that *Annals* 15. 44, which tells how Nero fastened the guilt for the fire in Rome on the Christians, "a mischievous superstition", so called from Christus, who was punished by Pilate, may be dependent upon the "Testimonium Flavianum", or both may draw on a common source. We may comment that because the passages in both Josephus and Tacitus are so short, are in different languages, and have no striking facts in common, the burden of proof must rest on those asserting dependence.

We have already commented above on the discrepancy between Josephus' and Tacitus' accounts of the terms of office of the procurators Cumanus and Felix. Even if we say that Josephus and Tacitus complement each other to some degree, as ABERBACH (3327) suggests, certain puzzles remain. SMALLWOOD (3328) notes that elsewhere (e.g., *Ann.* 12. 23) Tacitus shows confusion about Judaism, and Josephus is generally much fuller. SAUMAGNE (3329), noting that Josephus' accounts vary in each of the three places where he mentions Felix, prefers Tacitus, whose sources, he thinks, were more exact. But, we may comment, the discrepancies in Josephus' accounts are minor, and it seems hard to believe that Josephus, who came from Judea, would have been less well informed than Tacitus on matters concerning which there was no reason for him to misrepresent the facts.

SADDINGTON (3330), pp. 117–121, as we have remarked above, notes that on the two occasions when Josephus and Tacitus refer to the same auxiliaries, once Josephus (War 2. 236) supplies clearer detail than Tacitus (*Ann.* 12. 54. 3), whereas on the other occasion it is Tacitus (*Hist.* 5. 1. 2) who is more precise than Josephus (War 5. 47ff.). Both, he concludes, are describing the situation as it was in the early principate.



BAER (3331) suggests, but hardly proves, that for the very last days of the siege and fall of Jerusalem, Josephus and Tacitus used a common source written by a Roman military expert, but that Josephus has distorted and falsified this source.

### 27.3: Parallels between Josephus and Suetonius

(3332) BIRGITTA TAMM: Ist der Castortempel das *vestibulum* zu dem Palast des Caligula gewesen? In: *Eranos* 62, 1964, pp. 146–169.

TAMM (3332), comparing Josephus' account of Caligula's assassination with those of Suetonius and Dio, confirms Suetonius' statement (Caligula 22) that there was a bridge adjacent to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus connecting the imperial palace and the capitol and asserts that the statues which were adjacent to Caligula's extension of the palace were connected in Suetonius' Caligula 22 in the same way as in Josephus.

### 27.4: Parallels between Josephus and Lucian

(3333) GERT AVENARIUS: *Lukians Schrift zur Geschichtsschreibung*. Meisenheim/Glan 1956.

AVENARIUS (3333) shows that Lucian's 'Quomodo historia conscribenda sit' is a collection of historiographical commonplaces, many of which originated in Isocratean rhetoric. Though there are frequent parallels with Josephus, AVENARIUS does not regard them as sufficiently distinctive to warrant a hypothesis of influence, but rather supports his theory of a widespread historiographical and rhetorical tradition which had an impact upon both Josephus and Lucian, as well as upon many others of the period.

### 27.5: Parallels between Josephus and Apuleius

(3333a) REINHOLD MERKELBACH: *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike*. München 1962.

MERKELBACH (3333a), p. 17, compares the Mundus-Paulina affair (Ant. 18. 65–80) with the Cupid-Psyche story in Apuleius (Metamorphoses 4. 28–6. 24) as an instance of a *ἱερὸς γάμος* of the Isis mysteries.

### 27.6: Parallels between Josephus and Dio Cassius

(3334) MENAHEM STEIN: Josephus the Silent and Forgetful (in Hebrew). In his: *Collected Essays*, ed. JUDAH ROSENTHAL. Tel-Aviv 1970. Pp. 56–57.

(3335) KARL-HEINZ ZIEGLER: *Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und dem Partherreich; ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Völkerrechts*. Wiesbaden 1964.

- (3336) INGOMAR WEILER: Titus und die Zerstörung des Tempels von Jerusalem – Absicht oder Zufall? In: *Klio* 50, 1968, pp. 139–158.
- (3336a) M. M. EISMAN: Dio and Josephus: Parallel Analyses. In: *Latomus* 36, 1977, pp. 657–673.

Though there are a number of parallels between Josephus and Dio (who died after 229), there is no reason for supposing direct influence because of numerous differences between them.

STEIN (3334), pp. 56–57, notes, for example, that Dio says that many Romans deserted to the Jewish side during the great Jewish war, a fact omitted by Josephus. It would be worthwhile, as STEIN argues, to investigate such omissions systematically.

ZIEGLER (3335), pp. 62–63, like most commentators before him, prefers the account of Josephus (Ant. 18. 101–102) of the meeting of Vitellius and Artabanus on the Euphrates in 37, which records only a meeting on a bridge and a dinner given by Herod the Tetrarch, to the accounts of Dio (59. 23. 3) and Suetonius (Caligula 14, Vitellius 2), in which Artabanus adored the Roman standards and the images of the Empire.

WEILER (3336) observes that the first part of Dio's account of the capture of Jerusalem is closely dependent on Books 5 and 6 of Josephus' 'War'. We may remark, however, that the connection is in general content rather than in language and style and is hardly as close as WEILER claims.

EISMAN (3336a) notes similarities between Josephus and Dio Cassius concerning the methods and goals of the historian and the account of the historian's exploits in war. The main difference, he says, is that Dio is implicit, whereas Josephus is explicit. We may comment that the parallels are hardly distinctive but rather are historiographical commonplaces in writers such as Thucydides and especially Polybius.

## 27.7: Josephus' Influence on Porphyry

- (3337) PAOLO FRASSINETTI: Porfirio esegeta del profeta Daniele. In: *Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo di Scienze e Lettere* 86, 1953, pp. 194–210.
- (3338) GÜNTHER C. HANSEN: Ein verkanntes Iosephos-Zitat bei Porphyrios. In: *Klio* 48, 1967, pp. 199–200.

The only extant pagan writer who definitely knows the works of Josephus is Porphyry (233–c. 304), who in his *De Abstinentia ab Esu Animalium* 4. 11 states that the Essenes are referred to in the second book of his 'Jewish History', in the eighteenth book of his 'Archaeology', and in the second book of his 'To the Greeks' (Πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, i.e. 'Against Apion'). While we do, indeed, have references to the Essenes in the first two of these citations, we strangely do not have any reference in the third. Moreover, Porphyry claims that he read in Josephus that the Essenes abstained from meat and wine, a statement which is repeated in Jerome (*Adversus Jovinianum* 2. 14 = *Patrologia Latina* 23. 317A), but which is not to be found in Josephus. Of course, Porphyry may have had a different manuscript from any of those available to us, or he may be quoting

from memory. Moreover, FRASSINETTI (3337) asserts that Porphyry, in his 'Contra Christianos', is indebted to Josephus' 'Against Apion', among others. Finally, that Porphyry does seem to have known Josephus is indicated from the fact that 'De Abstinencia ad Esu Animalium' 4. 18 is based on War 7. 352–356, as HANSEN (3338) has noted. Since, shortly before, Porphyry had transcribed a long piece from War 2. 119–159 on the Essenes, it is likely that he used Josephus directly rather than a common source. We may add that such a passage, representing an indirect tradition of the text of Josephus, may profitably be used to check Josephus' text.

## 27.8: Libanius

(3338a) MENAHEM STERN: Libanius and Josephus (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 42, 1977, pp. 298–301.

STERN (3338a) concludes that Libanius, *Orationes*, 20. 30, which alludes to an unfair dealing of Vespasian with suppliants from Palestine, shows knowledge of Josephus (War 3. 532–542), who refers to the murder of the Jews in Tarichaeae at the time of Vespasian's Galilaean campaign. Libanius looked upon Theodosius' mild response to the revolt against him in Antioch in 387 as the reflection of another Vespasian.

## 27.9: The Church Fathers in General

(3339) ROBERT DEVREESE: *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois (Fragments tirés des Chaînes)*. Città del Vaticano 1959.

(3340) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*. Leiden 1972.

(3341) GUSTAVE BARDY: *Le souvenir de Josèphe chez les Pères*. In: *Revue d'histoire Ecclésiastique* 43, 1948, pp. 179–191.

(3342) ERNST R. CURTIUS: *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern 1948. Trans. into English by WILLARD R. TRASK: *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. New York 1953.

(3342a) VASSILIOS CHRISTIDÈS: *L'énigme d'Ophir*. In: *Revue Biblique* 77, 1970, pp. 240–247.

DEVREESE (3339), p. 21, lists four fragments of the 'Antiquities' (1. 193, 1. 238, 2. 253, and 5. 227) and one of the 'War' (5. 217) found in the 'Catenae' and in fragmentary works of Church Fathers, which, we may comment, may be of some value for checking the text of Josephus, since they are older than our oldest manuscripts of Josephus. These citations are omitted from SCHRECKENBERG's (3340) book, which attempts to list all citations from Josephus in later antiquity and in the Middle Ages.

BARDY (3341) presents a very cursory summary of Josephus' influence on Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, John Chrysostom, and Theodoret.

CURTIUS (3342) has a number of indications of Josephus' influence on the Church Fathers and on the Middle Ages. In particular, he notes, p. 219, that

Josephus' comparison of the fallen angels (Ant. 1. 73) with the giants of Greek mythology has been taken over by Tertullian (Apology 22) and Lactantius (Divine Institutes 10. 14).

CHRISTIDÈS (3342a) notes that Basil, probably drawing upon Josephus, and Procopius of Gaza, drawing directly on Josephus (Ant. 8. 164), situate Ophir (Gen. 10. 29) in India.

### 27.10: The Greek Hegesippus

- (3343) KARL MRAS: Die Hegesippus-Frage. In: Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien 95, 1958, pp. 143–153.
- (3344) NIELS HYLDAHL: Hegesippus Hypomnemata. In: Studia Theologica (Lund) 14, 1960, pp. 70–113.
- (3345) B. GUSTAFSSON: Hegesippus' Sources and His Reliability. In: Studia Patristica 3, Berlin 1961, pp. 227–232.
- (3346) GUY SCHOFIELD: In the Year 62: The Murder of the Brother of the Lord and Its Consequences. London 1962.

MRAS (3343), in a brief, general survey, contends that the second-century Greek Hegesippus (to be distinguished from the Latin Hegesippus who paraphrased the 'War') used Josephus directly. He explains his hostility to the Jews by postulating that he was a Jew who had become converted to Christianity.

HYLDAHL (3344), pp. 94–103, briefly comparing Hegesippus' treatment of the seven sects with Josephus' treatment of the four philosophies, says that his manner of description corresponds completely to that of Josephus. After comparing, pp. 108–112, their descriptions of the martyrdom of James the brother of Jesus, he concludes that Hegesippus was not a Jewish Christian but rather anti-Jewish, as seen by the changes that he made in Josephus' account. We may react, however, by noting that historically, at any rate, it has often been the Jews who have left Judaism who have turned out to be most fiercely opposed to Judaism.

GUSTAFSSON (3345) says that Hegesippus is generally very repetitive and obscure, though he is fairly faithful to his sources and renders an oral tradition of genuine, though legendary, type. He cogently concludes, however, that his account of the martyrdom of James is very questionable as compared with that of Josephus, whom we can trust.

SCHOFIELD (3346), in a popular, journalistic account, is unconvincing in his view that Hegesippus does not really contradict Josephus and that his account of James is authentic.

### 27.11: Hippolytus (see also 22.17)

- (3347) MATTHEW BLACK: The Account of the Essenes in Hippolytus and Josephus. In: WILLIAM D. DAVIES and DAVID DAUBE, edd., The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology: Studies in Honour of C. H. Dodd. Cambridge 1956. Pp. 172–175.

- (3348) MORTON SMITH: *The Description of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 29, 1958, pp. 273–313.
- (3349) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Account of the Essenes in Josephus and the Philosophumena*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 49, 1958–59, pp. 292–300.
- (3350) GEORGE W. E. NICKELSBURG: *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Inter-testamental Judaism*. Diss., Th.D., Harvard University Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. 1967. Publ.: Cambridge, Mass. 1972.
- (3350a) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: *Die Essener bei Hippolyt: Hippolyt, Ref. IX 18,2–28,2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119–161*. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 8, 1977, pp. 1–41.

BLACK (3347) concludes that the author of the account of the Essenes in *Refutatio Omnium Haeresium* (or *Philosophumena*) 9. 18–28, ascribed to Hippolytus (c. 225 C.E.), either had a different edition of Josephus from that which we have, or that he independently used one of the sources utilized by Josephus for his account in *War* 2. 119–166. Josephus, according to BLACK, adapted his account to Greek conceptions, whereas Hippolytus remained more faithful to his source.

SMITH (3348) independently arrives at BLACK's conclusion that Josephus and Hippolytus had a common source; his comparison of the two accounts, however, is much more thorough, and his certainty all the greater that, despite the view held by most editors, Hippolytus shows no knowledge of Josephus and, in fact, contradicts him.

ZEITLIN (3349) asserts, in opposition to SMITH, that Josephus could not have used a outside source, since no one in Judea could write on the Essenes in Greek; but Greek, as we can see from the inscriptions, the findings at Qumran, and the Talmudic writings, was widely known in the land of Israel, and, moreover, Philo in Alexandria had written on the Essenes in Greek. ZEITLIN conjectures that Hippolytus' source was Hegesippus, who here had 'corrected' Josephus.

NICKELSBURG (3350), p. 350, concludes that Josephus and Hippolytus drew upon a common source for their statements about the Essenes' belief in the immortality of the soul.

BURCHARD (3350a) concludes that Hippolytus is probably directly dependent upon Josephus, though he concedes that possibly both have a common source.

## 27.12: Origen

- (3350b) ROBERT M. GRANT: *The Earliest Lives of Jesus*. New York and London 1961.
- (3350c) HENRI CROUZEL: *Bibliographie critique d'Origène*. The Hague 1971.
- (3350d) NICHOLAS DE LANGE: *Origen and the Jews: Studies in Jewish-Christian Relations in Third-Century Palestine* (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, 25). Cambridge 1976.

GRANT (3350b), p. 115, notes that Josephus was Origen's most useful source for confirming the Bible, and hence he employed his writings more fully than those of any other historian. Indeed, it appears that when Origen speaks of history without further specification he has Josephus in mind.

CROUZEL (3350c) includes a year-by-year bibliography (through 1969) on the influence of Josephus upon Origen.

DE LANGE (3350d), pp. 64–68, notes that the charge that the Jews were originally runaway slaves or rebels, which is found in 'Against Apion', is given a new twist by Celsus in accusing the Christians of rebelling in a similar way against the Jews (*Contra Celsum*, 2. 5, 5. 33). Similarly, Celsus says that the Jews are a barbarous, modern people, citing 'Against Apion' and 'Ad Graecos' of Tatian. On the charge that the Jews are plagiarists Origen, like Josephus, replies that Greek philosophy partly, if not wholly, is derived from the Bible. Like Josephus, Origen does not deny the charge of atheism but shows the superiority of Jewish monotheism (*Contra Celsum*, 1. 32, 8. 13ff.).

### 27.13: Theophilus, Eusebius, John Chrysostom, and Pseudo-Kaisarios

- (3351) ROBERT M. GRANT: Notes on the Text of Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* III. In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 12, 1958, pp. 136–144.
- (3352) ALBERT-MARIE DENIS: Héracles et ses cousins de Judée. Le syncrétisme d'un historien juif hellénistique. In: *Hommages à Marie Delcourt*. Brussels 1970. Pp. 168–178.
- (3353) STAMATIA KRAWCZYŃSKI and UTTO RIEDINGER: Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte des Flavius Josephus und Klemens von Alexandria im 4.–6. Jahrhundert. In: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 57, 1964, pp. 6–25.
- (3353a) R. RIEDINGER: *Pseudo-Kaisarios. Überlieferungsgeschichte und Verfasserfrage*. München 1969.
- (3353b) VASSILIOS CHRISTIDÈS: L'énigme d'Ophir. In: *Revue Biblique* 77, 1970, pp. 240–247.
- (3353c) HAIM COHN: *The Trial and Death of Jesus*. New York 1971.
- (3353d) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, ed.: *Flavius Josèphe: Guerre des Juifs, Livre I*. Paris 1975.
- (3353e) ROBERT M. GRANT: Eusebius, Josephus and the Fate of the Jews. In: *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*, vol. 2, ed. PAUL J. ACHTEMEIER. Missoula, Montana 1979. Pp. 69–86.

GRANT (3351) concludes that in *Ad Autolyicum* 3. 20–22, Theophilus, bishop of Antioch from 176 to 186, in his account of the names and lengths of the reigns of the Egyptian kings, is following Josephus (*Against Apion* 1. 94–103) on the basis of Manetho, and that he is following Josephus (*Against Apion* 1. 117–126), who there cites Menander of Ephesus. He concludes that in his world chronology in 3. 24–28 Theophilus is guilty of unintelligent copying of Josephus. We may comment that inasmuch as Theophilus is one of the earliest writers to mention Josephus, such passages are of real value in reconstructing his Greek text.

DENIS (3352) indicates that Eusebius (ca. 263–ca. 339), *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9. 20. 3–4, borrowed, not directly from Alexander Polyhistor but indirectly through Josephus, *Antiquities* 1. 240–241, his version of Cleodemus' account of the relationship of Heracles to the Jews. The fact that Eusebius' spelling of the proper names is different from that in Josephus may, we suggest, be explained by the fact that he had a different manuscript or that he may have edited this spelling.

KRAWCZYŃSKI and RIEDINGER (3353), pp. 6–15, cite the text of *Antiquities* 10. 269–277, as found in John Chrysostom (347–407) and Pseudo-Kaisarios, the latter of whom (ca. 550) used not only Josephus but also Chrysostom's *Adversus Judaeos* 4–8. The critical text of this passage which they then edit with full apparatus criticus (NIESE had cited the text of Chrysostom from MONTFAUCON's edition, which was hardly critical; the text of Pseudo-Kaisarios has not hitherto been published) rests on three Greek manuscripts and a translation into Old Bulgarian and should be of value for the text edition of Josephus, since it represents a tradition considerably older than the oldest extant Greek manuscript of Josephus.

RIEDINGER (3353a), pp. 260 and 379, comments on Pseudo-Kaisarios' indirect use of Josephus via John Chrysostom in *Antiquities* 10. 209–277.

CHRISTIDÈS (3353b) notes that Eusebius' 'Onomasticon' confuses Solomon's Ophir with Yoktan (*Ant.* 1. 147).

COHN (3353c) deals with Eusebius' use of the material found in Josephus.

PELLETIER (3353d), pp. 15–23, summarizes the indirect manuscript tradition of the 'Jewish War', noting, in particular, the citations in Eusebius. PELLETIER concludes that where there are discrepancies these are due chiefly to emendations made by Eusebius himself. Eusebius ignored large parts of the first book of the 'Jewish War' because he looked with disfavor upon Herod.

GRANT (3353e) concludes that Eusebius, in his 'Chronicle', used Josephus as his chief source for his account of the death of James. In his 'Ecclesiastical History' Eusebius used Origen's 'Contra Celsum' but also used Josephus directly, as well as Hegesippus, for his account of the same incident. This will account for his confusion. In his 'Ecclesiastical History' (3. 7. 7–9) Eusebius owes much to Origen, as well as to Josephus. When he speaks of the philanthropy of G-d which respected the protection given by the apostles, especially James, living in Jerusalem, and which exhibited patience in case the Jews should repent, Eusebius is dependent upon a passage in Josephus (*War* 1. 10) which ascribes the same quality to Titus. In his account of the ambiguous oracle (*War* 6. 312–313) that someone from Judea would rule the earth, Eusebius is presenting a reinterpreted version of Josephus, possibly relying upon Origen. He concludes that whereas Josephus himself denounced the rebels on theological grounds, both Origen and Eusebius amplified the denunciations, and that whenever Eusebius makes statements about the theological-historical importance of the Jewish people in the first century he relies upon Josephus and Origen.

#### 27.14: Minucius Felix and Tertullian

(3354) GILLES QUISPÈL: A Jewish Source of Minucius Felix: In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 3, 1949, pp. 113–122.

(3354a) CLAUDE AZIZA: *Tertullian et le Judaïsme*. Diss., Nice 1972. Publ. (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres et des Sciences Humaines de Nice, 16): Paris 1977.

QUISPÈL (3354) notes that Minucius Felix (*Octavius* 33. 4) mentions the writings of two 'Romans', Josephus and Antonius Julianus, the author of 'De

Judaeis'. He finds passages in 'Octavius' which cannot be paralleled in early Christian literature but which are closely paralleled in pseudo-Clement's 'Hymniae' and which, he theorizes, must have been taken from a lost Jewish apology. This apology is not 'Against Apion', which lacks verbal affinity.

AZIZA (3354a) concludes that Tertullian used Josephus (Apion 1. 103 ff.) directly rather than at second hand through Tatian and Theophilus and (p. 210) that, in particular, Josephus influenced Tertullian's style in apologetics.

### 27.15: Jerome

(3355) PIERRE P. COURCELLE: *Les Lettres grecques en Occident, de Macrobie à Cassiodore*. Paris 1943. Trans. into English by HARRY E. WEDECK: *Late Latin Writers*. Cambridge, Mass. 1969.

(3356) JAY BRAVERMAN: *Jerome as a Biblical Exegete in Relation to Rabbinic and Patristic Tradition as Seen in His Commentary on Daniel*. Diss., Yeshiva University, New York 1970. Published as: *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series, 7), Washington 1978.

In a famous remark Jerome (340–420), in his 'Epistula ad Eustochium', 22. 35 (= *Patrologia Latina* 22. 421), praises Josephus as a second Livy. Indeed, so marked was Jerome's favor for Josephus that during his lifetime it was thought, without basis, that he had translated Josephus' 'War' into Latin.

COURCELLE (3355), pp. 83–86 (English translation), asserts that Jerome was extraordinarily dependent on Josephus (Josephus was almost his bedside book), all of whose works he had read in Greek, and that many other historians whom he quotes are known to him only through Josephus, from whom he often borrows without acknowledgement. Jerome is particularly dependent on Josephus for matters of chronology and genealogy, Jewish history and antiquities, particularly with regard to the priesthood. Moreover, most of Jerome's explanations in his 'Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesin' are taken from the first book of the 'Antiquities', although he avoids mention of Josephus except to criticize him. We may suggest that a full-scale study of Jerome's dependence on Josephus is a real desideratum.

BRAVERMAN (3356), pp. 152–159, significantly cites Jerome's use of Josephus (Ant. 10. 195) on Daniel 12. 1, where there is no extant rabbinic parallel. He also notes, pp. 220–223, Jerome's indebtedness to Josephus (Ant. 10. 276 = Daniel 9. 24–27 or perhaps 11. 30 ff.), who is deliberately ambiguous in not daring to be more explicit about the eventual triumph of Israel because of his Roman patrons, who were very sensitive to any spark of Jewish rebellion. BRAVERMAN similarly notes Jerome's use of Antiquities 10. 210 ff. (= Daniel 2. 36 ff.), which deliberately omits the current Jewish interpretation that the Messianic kingdom would put an end to the Roman Empire.



**27.16: Augustine**

- (3357) BERTHOLD ALTANER: *Augustinus und die griechische Patristik: Eine Einführung und Nachlese zu den quellenkritischen Untersuchungen*. In: *Revue Bénédictine* 62, 1952, pp. 201–215.
- (3358) PIERRE COURCELLE: *Les Lettres grecques en Occident, de Macrobe à Cassiodore*. Paris 1943. Trans. into English by HARRY E. WEDECK: *Late Latin Writers*. Cambridge, Mass. 1969.

ALTANER (3357) states that Augustine (354–430) derived knowledge of Josephus through the Latin Hegesippus, and that since there was not yet a Latin translation available of the 'Antiquities', Augustine probably did not use Antiquities 11–14 as a source for the City of G-d 18. 45. 2–3.

COURCELLE (3358), p. 198 (English translation) notes that before 419 Augustine had read the 'De Excidio Jerusalem', perhaps in the translation by Pseudo-Hegesippus or Rufinus, and that before 425 he had read the 'Antiquities', of which he used at least the synopses (City of G-d 18. 45. 2–3), inasmuch as the chapter on the history of Israel from the building of the Temple to the birth of Jesus is almost a verbatim copy of the summaries of Books 11 to 14 of the 'Antiquities'.

**27.17: Cassiodorus**

- (3359) WALTER CAHN: *An Illustrated Josephus from the Meuse Region in Merton College, Oxford*. In: *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 29, 1966, pp. 295–310.
- (3360) PIERRE COURCELLE: *Les Lettres grecques en Occident, de Macrobe à Cassiodore*. Paris 1943. Trans. into English by HARRY E. WEDECK: *Late Latin Writers*. Cambridge, Mass. 1969.

Josephus was translated into Latin at the instigation of Cassiodorus (c. 480–c. 575), who, as CAHN (3359), p. 295, notes, inserted a painting of the tabernacle in the desert based on the description of the 'Antiquities' in his *Codex Grandior* (Cassiodorus, In *Psalmos* 86. 1 = *Patrologia Latina* 70. 618): this painting appears in the *Codex Amiatinus*, which is a copy of Cassiodorus' original.

COURCELLE (3360), p. 354 (English translation), remarks that Cassiodorus frequently and carefully used Josephus' text, to which he always gives precise reference.

**27.18: Coptic Literature**

- (3361) JAN ZANDEE: *Iosephus contra Apionem: An Apocryphal Story of Joseph in Coptic*. In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 15, 1961, pp. 193–213.

ZANDEE (3361) presents a translation into English of and commentary on a fourth-century papyrus in the Sahidic dialect now in the University Library at Utrecht containing an apocryphal story of a monk-like Joseph being cast into a well and travelling with the Ishmaelite traders. One of the traders is called

Apion, the name of the notorious anti-Semite against whom Josephus wrote his treatise; and ZANDEE concludes that the story represents an intermediate stage between Jewish apocryphal writings and Christian hagiography. But Josephus' work against Apion is, we may comment, unknown in the Jewish tradition; and there are striking differences between this account and the one that is found in Jewish Midrashim; hence this may represent a Hellenistic Jewish Midrash.

### 27.19: Armenian Literature

- (3362) JACOB NEUSNER: The Jews in Pagan Armenia. In: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 84, 1964, pp. 230–240.  
 (3362a) MOSES KHORENATS'I: History of the Armenians. Trans. and commentary by ROBERT W. THOMSON (*Harvard Armenian Texts and Studies*, 4). Cambridge, Mass. 1978.

NEUSNER (3362), p. 329, says that the Armenian historian Moses Xorenazi (2. 19) reports that Tigranes took Jerusalem and deported the high priest Hyrcanus along with other Jews to Armenia, as well as many other details which show that he was dependent on Josephus but on a version different from any that we have. Moreover, he includes and, indeed, stresses details, such as the Armenian participation in the Parthian invasion, which are not to be found in Josephus at all. NEUSNER postulates that Xorenazi's account is based on an Armenian version of Josephus which included substantial details of Armenian history. We may comment that inasmuch as there are so many versions of Josephus in other languages it would not be surprising if there were one in Armenian as well, but we have no trace of such a version, nor even of any fragments; it may well be worth investigating Armenian literature for further such references to Josephus.

KHORENATS'I (3362a) has been translated and commented upon. The editor, Thomson, concludes that Moses of Chorene (Moses Xorenazi or Khorenats'i) used the 'War' in an Armenian translation but did not have access to the 'Antiquities', which had not been translated into Armenian, though he used it indirectly through Eusebius.

### 27.20: Syriac Literature

- (3362b) ALLISON P. HAYMAN, ed. and trans.: The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew (*Corpus Christianorum Orientalium*, 338–339). Louvain 1973.  
 (3362c) SEBASTIAN P. BROCK: Some Syriac Accounts of the Jewish Sects. In: ROBERT H. FISCHER, ed., *A Tribute to Arthur Vööbus: Studies in Early Christian Literature and Its Environment, Primarily in the Syrian East*. Chicago 1977. Pp. 265–276.

HAYMAN (3362b) concludes that there must have been a translation of the entire 'Jewish War' into Syriac, inasmuch as there are quotations from various parts of it in Sergius the Stylite and in other Syriac works. Sergius' quotations from Book 6 of the 'War' draw upon the Syriac version in the *Codex Ambro-*

sianus, and his quotations from other books come from a Syriac version, of which that found in the Codex Ambrosianus is only a part.

BROCK (3362c) concludes that the twelfth-century Syrian Dionysios Bar Salibi, metropolitan of Amid and among the most learned figures of the Syrian Orthodox renaissance, in the first chapter of his 'Against the Jews', is indebted to Josephus (War 2. 106–166) for his account of the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes. He declares that Dionysios' access to Book 2 of the 'War' (probably not direct) implies, as HAYMAN (3362b) had stated, that the work was once available in Syriac translation in its entirety, whereas today we have only Book 6. BROCK notes the parallels between Dionysios and the translation of the 'Anakephalaiosis' of Epiphanius' 'Panarion', Theodore Bar Koni's 'Liber Scholiorum' (5), Michael the Syrian's 'Chronicle' (6. 1), Isho'dad's 'Commentary on Matthew' (22. 23) and the list of Jewish sects in India Office MS. Syr. 9, ff. 52<sup>r</sup>, 54<sup>v</sup>–55<sup>r</sup>.

## 27.21: Josephus' Influence during the Middle Ages Generally

- (3363) MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER: Allgemeine Einleitung in die jüdische Literatur des Mittelalters. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 16, 1903–4, pp. 373–395.
- (3364) ANDRÉ WILMART: Le Convent et la Bibliothèque de Cluny vers le Milieu du XI<sup>e</sup> Siècle. In: *Revue Mabillon* 11, 1921, pp. 89–124.
- (3365) ANSCARI MUNDO: Bibliotheca, Bible et lecture du Carême d'après St. Benoit. In: *Revue Bénédictine* 60, 1950, pp. 65–92.
- (3366) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Madaba Mosaic Map, with Introduction and Commentary. Jerusalem 1954.
- (3367) SISTER NICHOLAS MALTMAN: Pilate – Os Malleatoris. In: *Speculum* 36, 1961, pp. 308–311.
- (3367a) ALBERT SIEGMUND: Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert (Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Benediktiner-Akademie, Bd. 5). München 1949.
- (3367b) B. SCHELLE: Frechulph von Lisieux. Untersuchungen zu Leben und Werk. Diss., München 1952.
- (3367c) JOSEPH DAN: Chronicles of Moses. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 12, Jerusalem 1971, p. 413.

During the Middle Ages and into modern times Josephus was associated with either pagan or Christian authorities, as the occasion demanded. Indeed, he was regarded as a veritable polymath – an authority in such diverse fields as Biblical exegesis, allegory, chronology, arithmetic (the Josephus-spiel was one of the popular arithmetical problems of the Middle Ages), astronomy, natural history, geography of the Holy Land, grammar, etymology, and Jewish theology. When the Christians were largely cut off from the direct Jewish tradition, it was Josephus who supplied the pilgrims with knowledge of the Holy Land (his influence on the Crusades is a fascinating chapter that remains to be investigated), their teachers with knowledge of Jewish history and the Jewish religion and lore, and their military leaders with military tactics and formulae. Because of the famous 'Testimonium Flavianum' Josephus was regarded as

having borne witness to the miracles and messiahship and resurrection of Jesus; and it is not surprising that in the catalogues of medieval libraries his works commonly appear with the Church Fathers.

STEINSCHNEIDER (3363), pp. 393–394, well remarks that the Jew Josephus was the 'Ze'enah U-re'enah' (the homiletic paraphrase of the Pentateuch so popular especially in Eastern Europe among Jewish women) of the Christians throughout the whole Middle Ages. We find, for example, as WILMART (3364), pp. 92–94, notes, that Josephus' name appears in the list of authors whose works were read during Lent in the monastery of Cluny. MUNDO (3365) remarks that the practice of reading Josephus and other authors during Lent in place of the Bible exclusively is against the original intent of St. Benedict's Rule. During the Middle Ages Josephus' influence was even greater than it has been in modern times because he was said to have written certain works which we now generally regard as spurious, notably IV Maccabees and Hegesippus, as well as the 'Testimonium Flavianum'.

AVI-YONAH (3366) notes that the chief source for the names on the Madaba map, dated from ca. 560–565, and the only extant one of ancient Palestine, is Eusebius' 'Onomasticon', but that Josephus is the source of seven items.

MALTMAN (3367) traces the characteristics, in such medieval writers as Rabanus Maurus (ca. 780–856), of Pilate as "the mouth of the hammerer" back to Eusebius' *Historia Ecclesiastica* 1. 41–42, which, in turn, closely paraphrases Josephus' account (War 2. 175–177 and Ant. 18. 60–62) of the vehemence with which Pilate's soldiers beat the Jews with clubs when they protested Pilate's use of the money belonging to the Temple for an aqueduct. We may comment that the devil is commonly characterized in medieval lore as the hammerer of the whole earth; but it is more likely that Pilate is compared to the devil by Christian writers because of his role in the crucifixion of Jesus than because of his suppression of the Jews (ξύλον in War 2. 176 or σκυτάλη in Antiquities 18. 61 is a club or cudgel, not a hammer).

SIEGMUND (3367a), pp. 102–107, lists manuscripts of Josephus found in European libraries and discusses the tradition of the Latin Josephus.

SHELLE (3367b), pp. 109–110, discusses the history of the tradition of the Latin Josephus.

DAN (3367c) discusses the influence of the Hebrew 'Chronicle of Moses', an account of the life of Moses written in the early Middle Ages which includes a very detailed narrative about how Moses became king of Ethiopia after he had driven away Balaam, who had usurped the throne there; we may suggest that a comparison with Josephus, Antiquities, 2. 238–253, would prove fruitful.

## 27.22: The Alexander Legend

(3368) GEORGE A. CARY: Alexander the Great in Mediaeval Theology. In: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 17, 1954, pp. 98–114.

(3369) GEORGE A. CARY: *The Medieval Alexander*, ed. by DAVID J. A. ROSS. Cambridge 1956.

- (3370) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: La leyenda de Alejandro en la literatura medieval. In: *Romance Philology* 15, 1961–62, pp. 311–318.
- (3370a) FRIEDRICH PFISTER: Alexander der Grosse in den Offenbarungen der Griechen, Juden, Mohammedaner und Christen (*Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft*, 3). Berlin 1956. Rpt. in his: *Kleine Schriften*. Meisenheim 1976. Pp. 301–347.

CARY (3368) traces the medieval popularity of the story of Alexander's entry into Jerusalem: in general, however, the medieval theologians, except for Godfrey of Viterbo, depreciate Alexander, whereas Josephus portrays him as being under divine protection.

CARY (3369), pp. 125–130, notes how medieval theologians tried to discredit or disguise the meaning of Josephus' treatment of Alexander, notably G-d's working of miracles for Alexander in the Pamphylian Sea (*Ant.* 2. 348) and his reverence for G-d in Jerusalem (*Ant.* 11. 329–339).

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3370) presents an appreciation of Cary's work.

PFISTER (3370a) concludes that the accounts of Josephus and of the Talmud concerning Alexander and the Jews go back to a common late Hellenistic source. The most important report is that of Josephus, since it was widely disseminated through a Latin translation in the West in the Middle Ages.

## 27.23: Particular Medieval Latin Authors in Western Europe: Bede, Rabanus Maurus, Richard of St. Victor, Peter Comestor, Fulcher of Chartres

- (3371) BERNHARD BLUMENKRANZ: Les auteurs chrétiens latins du Moyen Âge sur les juifs et le judaïsme. Paris 1963.
- (3372) BERYL SMALLEY: *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Oxford 1941; 2nd ed., 1952.
- (3373) CESLAUS SPICQ: *Esquisse d'une histoire de l'exégèse latine au Moyen Âge*. Paris 1944.
- (3374) HANS VOLLMER: *Materialien zur Bibelgeschichte und religiösen Volkskunde des Mittelalters*, II, 1. Berlin 1925.
- (3374a) ALBERT SIEGMUND: *Die Überlieferung der griechischen christlichen Literatur in der lateinischen Kirche bis zum zwölften Jahrhundert* (*Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Benediktiner-Akademie*, 5). München 1949.
- (3374b) MAX L. W. LAISTNER: Bede as a Classical and a Patristic Scholar. In: *Transactions of the Royal History Society*, Ser. 4, vol. 16, 1933, pp. 69–94.
- (3374c) MAX L. W. LAISTNER: The Library of the Venerable Bede. In: ALEXANDER HAMILTON THOMPSON, ed., *Bede: His Life, Times, and Writings: Essays in Commemoration of the Twelfth Centenary of His Death*. Oxford 1935. Pp. 237–262.
- (3374d) FRIEDRICH PFISTER: Alexander der Grosse in den Offenbarungen der Griechen, Juden, Mohammedaner und Christen (*Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Schriften der Sektion für Altertumswissenschaft*, 3). Berlin 1956. Rpt. in his: *Kleine Schriften*. Meisenheim 1976. Pp. 301–347.
- (3374e) WERNER MÜLLER: *Die heilige Stadt. Roma quadrata, himmlisches Jerusalem und die Mythe vom Weltnabel*. Stuttgart 1961.

BLUMENKRANZ (3371), pp. 133, 186, notes that Bede (ca. 673–735) cites Josephus and Jerome as attesting to the value of the Hebrew version of the

Bible. BLUMENKRANZ's work, we may comment, is disappointing in failing to note Bede's frequent citations of Josephus.

SMALLEY (3372), p. 43, notes that Rabanus Maurus (ca. 780–856) collected scattered references from Josephus. She, p. 110, and SPICQ (3373), p. 78, cite one of the few writers, Richard of St. Victor, who takes a negative attitude toward Josephus, protesting as he does against certain persons, notably Andrew of St. Victor, who accepted Josephus as authoritative, just because he was Jew, rather than the Bible and Bede, whom Richard preferred.

VOLLMER (3374), pp. xxvi–xxviii, has called attention to the fact that Josephus was widely read in the Middle Ages through the 'Historia Scholastica' of the twelfth-century Peter Comestor, a summary of Biblical history, which, we may comment, soon became the most popular book in Western Europe. Comestor himself used Josephus to such a degree that often, even where Josephus is not cited, the Latin Josephus is to be used in determining the text of Comestor (and, we may add, vice versa), though the Latin text which he seems to have utilized appears to be interpolated or with glosses.

SIEGMUND (3374a), pp. 164–166, discusses the use of Josephus by Bede. We may comment that, as LAISTNER (3374b) (3374c) has shown, Bede's use of Josephus does not seem to have followed a uniform practice. For the 'Antiquities' Bede used only Cassiodorus' Latin version; for the 'War' he depended upon intermediate sources, notably Rufinus and Jerome. The question whether Bede read Josephus in the original Greek must remain under advisement.

PFISTER (3374d), pp. 47–50, notes that Josephus' comparison (Ant. 2. 347–348) of Alexander's miraculous crossing of the Pamphylian Sea with Moses' crossing of the Red Sea is repeated by a number of medieval authors, such as Peter Comestor and Gottfried of Viterbo. In particular, Pfister discusses the influence of Josephus on Peter Comestor.

MÜLLER (3374e), p. 53, notes that the view that (War 3. 52) Jerusalem lies in the middle of Judea and is called the navel of the land is repeated verbatim by Fulcher of Chartres (3. 30. 10, ed. HAGEMEYER).

## 27.24: Medieval Greek Authors in Eastern Europe: George Hamartolos, Anonymus 'De obsidione toleranda', Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, 'Palaea Historica'

- (3375) FRANCIS I. ANDERSEN: The Diet of John the Baptist. In: *Abr-Nahrein* 3, 1961–62, pp. 60–74.
- (3376) A. DAIN: Mémoire inédit sur la défense des places. In: *Revue des Études grecques* 53, 1940, pp. 123–136.
- (3377) HILDA VAN DEN BERG: *Anonymus de obsidione toleranda*. Leiden 1947.
- (3378) HANS G. BECK: *Kirche und theologische Literatur im Byzantinischen Reich* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 12. Abt.: Byzantisches Handbuch, 2. T., 1. Bd.). München 1959.
- (3379) GÜNTHER GENZ: *Die Kirchengeschichte des Nicephorus Callistus Xanthopulus und ihre Quellen*. Nachgelassene Untersuchungen. Berlin 1966.

- (3379a) SAMUEL KRAUSS: Die Namen der Königin von Saba. In: Festschrift Dr. Jakob Freimann zum 70. Geburtstag. Berlin 1937. Pp. 119–124.
- (3379b) DAVID FLUSSER: *Palaea Historica*: An Unknown Source of Biblical Legends. In: *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 22, 1971, pp. 48–79.
- (3379c) A. VASSILIEV: *Anecdota Graeco-Byzantina*. Moscow 1893.
- (3379d) RIVKAH FISHMAN-DUKER: The Second Temple Period in Byzantine Chronicles. In: *Byzantion* 47, 1977, pp. 126–156.

ANDERSEN (3375) has noted that, through his widely-used 'Chronicle', the ninth-century George Hamartolos ('George the Monk'), who made extensive use of Josephus, influenced Russian chronographers, including the person responsible for the Slavonic Josephus.

DAIN (3376) gives the Greek text and French translation of fragments of a tenth-century work which was probably the source of 'De obsidione toleranda' and which itself was indebted ultimately to War 3. 258–264. VAN DEN BERG (3377) contains a critical edition of this tenth-century treatise, more than half of which consists of illustrations drawn, often verbatim and without acknowledgment, from Polybius, Josephus, and Arrian.

BECK (3378), p. 705, and GENZ (3379), pp. 28–29, discuss a versified synopsis of Jewish history after the Maccabees based on Josephus by the fourteenth-century Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos.

KRAUSS (3379a) notes that George Hamartolos, citing Josephus as his source, identifies the Queen of Sheba as the Sibyl, queen of Ethiopia. Since there is no such passage in Josephus, his source must have been Pseudo-Josephus, the so-called Hegesippus.

FLUSSER (3379b) concludes that the 'Palaea Historica', a Biblical history in Greek published by VASSILIEV (3379c) shows indebtedness to Josephus. In particular, he notes, pp. 56–59, that Melchizedek is called a savage man, just as John the Baptist is described in the Slavonic Josephus. Again, he remarks, pp. 63–67, that the story of Moses choosing a torch rather than gold has a parallel in Josephus (Ant. 2. 233–236), though the 'Palaea Historica' has a second incident in which Moses pulls Pharaoh's beard and then has to choose between a crown and a naked sword (cf. 'Exodus Rabbah' [1. 31] and 'Chronicle of Moses'). This leads FLUSSER to conclude that the Midrashic sources are later and that the original was Hellenistic Jewish. As to the 'Palaea Historica's account of Moses' Ethiopian War (Ant. 2. 238–253), it has only a variant of Josephus, who, in turn, indirectly influenced the 'Chronicle of Moses'.

FISHMAN-DUKER (3379d) notes the reverence with which the "most wise" Josephus was held in almost every chronicle during the Byzantine period, though much of the material from Josephus was borrowed through intermediate sources. She concentrates on three chronicles – Malalas' 'Chronographia', George Hamartolos' 'Chronicon Syntomon', and Zonaras' 'Epitome', the last of which faithfully transmits the last nine books of Josephus' Antiquities.

### 27.25: The Medieval Legend of Josephus the Physician

- (3380) HANS LEWY: Josephus the Physician: A Mediaeval Legend of the Destruction of Jerusalem. In: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 1, 1937–38, pp. 221–242. Trans. into Hebrew by JOSHUA AMIR in his: *Studies in Jewish Hellenism*. Jerusalem 1960. Pp. 266–293.
- (3381) GUIDO KISCH: A Talmudic Legend as the Source for the Josephus Passage in the *Sachsenspiegel*. In: *Historia Judaica* 1, 1938–39, pp. 105–118.
- (3382) GUIDO KISCH: *Sachsenspiegel and Bible: Researches in the Source History of the Sachsenspiegel and the Influence of the Bible on Mediaeval German Law*. Notre Dame, Indiana 1941.
- (3383) GUIDO KISCH: *Jewry-Law in Mediaeval Germany: Laws and Court Decisions concerning Jews*. New York 1949.
- (3384) GUIDO KISCH: *Forschungen zur Rechts- und Sozialgeschichte der Juden in Deutschland während des Mittelalters*. Stuttgart 1955.
- (3384a) GUIDO KISCH: *The Jews in Medieval Germany. A Study in Their Legal and Social Status*. Chicago 1949; 2nd ed., New York 1970.
- (3384b) YITZHAK BAER: Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.

LEWY (3380) theorizes that a converted Jew, having read in Christian chronicles the story of Josephus' prophecy of Vespasian's succession (cf. War 3. 399–408), enriched it with details taken from the Talmudic account of Johanan ben Zakkai's prophecy of Vespasian's succession, and thus produced the legend, later mentioned in Landolfus Sagax (ca. 1000), 'Historia miscella', telling how Josephus cured Titus of a swollen leg. But, we may remark, Landolfus might well have read the Latin version of Josephus directly; the Talmudic account (Giṭṭin 56b), moreover, speaks only of a brain disease from which Titus suffered and died. Such a legend may well have arisen because, as LEWY also suggests, medieval rabbis were, in several cases, well known for their skill as physicians.

KISCH (3381) discusses a similar legend found in the 'Sachsenspiegel', a thirteenth-century compilation of Saxon law by Eike von Repgow which mentions that Josephus cured Titus of the gout. KISCH also cites similar accounts telling how Josephus cured Titus of palsy, found in the thirteenth-century 'Legenda Aurea' and in a fifteenth-century Copenhagen collection of legends. KISCH rightly cites as a parallel the Talmudic account of how Vespasian (confused with Titus in the medieval version) was at first unable to put on a boot but was able to do so after he had followed Rabbi Johanan's advice to allow someone whom he disliked to pass before him; similarly in the 'Legenda Aurea' and in the Copenhagen collection Josephus cures Titus by seating beside him the servant whom he most hated.

KISCH (3382), pp. 157–158, discussing the sources of the 'Sachsenspiegel', notes that such sections as 3. 42. 4, which says that everyone had to be released in the jubilee year, whether or not he so wished, go back to Antiquities 4. 273, whether directly or indirectly. He comments, pp. 170–171, on the passage (3. 7. 3) referring to the medical skill of Josephus in curing Titus of the gout, which, he says, most probably goes back to the legend of Vespasian being healed by Johanan ben Zakkai.



KISCH (3383) cites five other passages in German law books of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries which refer to Josephus' cure of Titus.

KISCH (3384), pp. 72–79, again deals with the theme of Josephus the physician who healed Titus, traces the source and purpose of the legend, and criticizes LEWY's article. The Josephus legend, he concludes, had no other goal but to establish the suzerainty of the king over the Jews historically and legally and to justify the existing juridical status of the Jews.

KISCH (3384a), pp. 154–167, discusses the Josephus-legend in Eike von Repkow and in the lawbooks known as the 'Schwabenspiegel' and the 'Sachsenspiegel'. The fact that, according to these works, Josephus cured Titus of gout explains the rights of the Jews under the German kings, who considered themselves successors of the Roman emperors.

BAER (3384b), pp. 181–183, concludes that the account of the cure of Vespasian's swollen foot by Johanan ben Zakkai, as stated in the Talmudic corpus (Giṭṭin 56b and parallels), is dependent upon Orosius, the Christian historian of the fifth century. To be sure, Orosius himself does not have this story, but Landolfus Sagax in the eleventh century, who copies Orosius, does have this incident, though with Josephus instead of Johanan curing Vespasian's foot. We may comment that, aside from the fact that Orosius himself does not have this version, there is no evidence that the prophecy of Johanan in 'Giṭṭin' of the accession of Vespasian shows dependence upon Josephus. We may also add that in view of the fact that there were Church Fathers, notably Jerome, who had Jewish teachers and who were acquainted with aggadic materials, it is quite conceivable that such materials became known to Church Fathers generally.

## 27.26: Josephus' Influence on Renaissance Figures (Nicolas de Lyre, Isaac Abrabanel) and in the Reformation and post-Reformation Periods

- (3385) HERMAN HAILPERIN: Rashi and the Christian Scholars. Pittsburgh 1963.
- (3386) ABRAHAM N. POLIAK: The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Approach. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 49, 1958–59, pp. 89–107.
- (3387) ÉLIE BIKERMAN: Une question d'authenticité. Les privilèges juifs. In: Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves (Brüssel) 13, 1953 (= Mélanges Isidore Lévy), pp. 11–34.
- (3388) HORST R. MOEHRING: The *Acta Pro Judaeis* in the *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus: A Study in Hellenistic and Modern Apologetic Historiography. In: JACOB NEUSNER, ed., Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty, Part 3: Judaism before 70 (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, vol. 12, part 3). Leiden 1975. Pp. 124–158.
- (3388a) PETER BURKE: A Survey of the Popularity of Ancient Historians 1450–1700. In: History and Theory 5, 1966, pp. 135–152.
- (3388b) RUTH KESTENBERG-GLADSTEIN: Čechen und Juden in altväterischer Zeit. In: Judaica Bohemiae 4.1, 1968, pp. 64–72.
- (3388c) ERWIN I. J. ROSENTHAL: *Studia Semitica*, vol. 1 (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, no. 16). Cambridge 1971.
- (3388d) MOSHE CARMILLY-WEINBERGER: Censorship and Freedom of Expression in Jewish History. New York 1977.

- (3388e) NORMAN ROTH: The 'Theft of Philosophy' by the Greeks from the Jews. In: *Classical Folia* 32, 1978, pp. 53–67.
- (3388f) SAMUEL KRAUSS: Die Namen der Königin von Saba. In: *Festschrift Dr. Jakob Freimann zum 70. Geburtstag*. Berlin 1937. Pp. 119–124.
- (3388g) JONATHAN R. ZISKIND: Petrus Cunaeus on Theocracy, Jubilee and the Latifundia. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 68, 1977–78, pp. 235–254.

HAILPERIN (3385), pp. 211–212, 340, notes that the fourteenth-century Nicolas de Lyre, *Glossa Ordinaria*, 1. 787, on Exodus 28, says that in priestly matters he would rather follow Josephus than the distinguished eleventh-century Jewish commentator Rashi, on whom he is generally so heavily dependent, because Josephus himself was of the priestly order and actually saw the Temple and its cult with own eyes. Lyre, *Glossa Ordinaria*, 1. 805–806, actually quotes Josephus verbatim on the cosmic-symbolic interpretation of the high priest's vestments (War 5. 231), and he leaves it to the reader to choose either Josephus' or Rashi's explanation of the high priest's oracle-stones, the Urim and Thummim.

POLIAK (3386) notes that the fifteenth-century Hebrew Biblical commentator Isaac Abrabanel knew Josephus directly (the extent of this knowledge, we may add, remains to be investigated), and not, as was true of other Jews of his time, merely through the paraphrase of Josippon, and that he sought to harmonize Josephus' identification (Ant. 1. 128) of the Kittim as the Cyprians with the view of Josippon identifying them with the Romans by postulating that Cyprus had been the original home of the Italians and Romans.

BIKERMAN (3387) and MOEHRING (3388), pp. 126–129, show that debate in the post-Reformation period concerning the authenticity of the documents in Books 14 and 16 of the 'Antiquities' is to be understood in the context of the Protestants' desire to discredit the authority of the books of the Maccabees, which the Catholics accepted as canonical.

BURKE (3388a) charts the variations in the popularity of the great Greek and Roman historians by counting their editions and by classifying them by country, discusses the diverse reasons for their popularity by analyzing their reputations, and notes that during the period from 1450 to 1700 there were more editions of Josephus' 'Antiquities' (73) and of the 'War' (68) than of any other Greek work. There were far more translations into German (23) than into Italian or English.

KESTENBERG-GLADSTEIN (3388b), pp. 64–68, comments on early Czech translations of Josephus, especially that of Plácel. He notes that several of them are chiliastic in their inspiration.

ROSENTHAL (3388c), pp. 43–44, notes that the Jewish Biblical commentator Abrabanel in the fifteenth century, unlike the great majority of his fellow Jews, distinguished between Josippon and the Latin text of Josephus.

CARMILLY-WEINBERGER (3388d), p. 206, presents a brief summary of the view of Josephus held by Abrabanel.

ROTH (3388e) comments on the reference by Abraham Bibago, a fifteenth-century Spanish Jewish philosopher, in his 'Derekh Emunah' (45b), to a book among the Christians written by a Greek sage named AGYHWSYBYW, which cites

many things from the books of the sages of Israel on research and philosophy and mentions the names of those sages who, with the author, lived at the time of the Second Temple. The Greek sage, he says, built his entire book on the fact that true wisdom and philosophy came to the Greeks from the Jews and quotes Alorqos (presumably Clearchus of Soli: Apion 1. 176–183) as giving the story of Aristotle's meeting with a Jew. ROTH conjectures that Agihosibio is Hege-sippus; but, we may comment, Hege-sippus has no such passage; and, moreover, he is in Latin (unless he is thinking of the Greek Hege-sippus, who similarly lacks this passage). The passage is cited by Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 1. 491. 14–492. 11. This will explain the phrase “a Greek sage among the Christians”. The entire book of Eusebius is indeed apologetic, as Bibago states, and this is not the starting point of Hege-sippus. Bibago, we may remark, elsewhere also refers to Eusebius. His reference to the sons of Quliah is a reference to the Calani (Apion 1. 179). The statement that the author of the passage cited by Bibago lived at the time of the Second Temple is correct; the author, that is Josephus, cited by Eusebius did live at the time of the Second Temple, and Eusebius knew this. Bibago does not, however, state that the person who cites the passage lived at the time of the Second Temple.

KRAUSS (3388f) notes that Abraham Zacuto (1452–1515), in his ‘*Sefer ha-Yuhasin*’, p. 237, gives the name of the Queen of Sheba as ‘Aqulah, which he apparently borrowed from Josephus (Ant. 8. 148), who gives her name as Nikaleu.

ZISKIND (3388g) notes that Petrus Cunaeus (Peter van der Kun), the author of ‘*De republica Hebraeorum*’, shows the pervasive influence of Josephus’ ‘*Against Apion*’, sometimes translating him verbatim, especially in proving that the Jews were more ancient than the Greeks (Apion 2. 154–155) and in praising the Jewish constitution as a theocracy (Apion 1. 60, 2. 164–166).

## 27.27: English Literature: General

- (3389) MOSES HADAS: *A History of Greek Literature*. New York 1950.
- (3390) HERBERT C. ZAFREN: Printed Rarities in the Hebrew Union College Library. In: *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 5, 1961, pp. 137–156.
- (3391) MURRAY ROSTON: *Biblical Drama in England from the Middle Ages to the Present Day*. London 1968.
- (3392) LEO MILLER: ‘Silo’s Brook’ in *Paradise Lost*: Another View. In: *Milton Quarterly*, vol. 6, no. 3, Oct. 1972, pp. 5–7.
- (3393) HENRY S. WILLIAMS: The ancient of days renewed; or the history of the United States found to have been written 1,826 years ago by Flavius Josephus, which is confirmed by the Apocrypha, the Apocryphal New Testament, the Book of Enoch, the Book of Jashar, and some sacred books that have always been reckoned among the profane. Chicago 1897.
- (3393a) ERWIN I. J. ROSENTHAL: *Studia semitica*, vol. 1 (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, no. 16). Cambridge 1971.
- (3393b) SAMUEL S. STOLLMAN: Milton’s Samson and the Jewish Tradition. In: *Milton Studies* 3, 1971, pp. 185–200.

Both in England and on the continent it is no exaggeration to say, as does HADAS (3389), p. 237, that Josephus was the most widely read of all ancient historians in modern times before the twentieth century. [See *infra*, p. 973.] Until our own days a very common sight in homes was a copy of Josephus (in England and in the United States most often in WHISTON's much reprinted translation) next to the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament, since the Jewish historian was regarded as the bridge between them. In fact, among strict English Protestants, only Josephus and the Bible were permitted to be read on Sunday, as ZAFREN (3390), p. 144, has remarked.

Very little has been written on the subject of Josephus' influence on English literature, even though this influence has been vast and pervasive in almost every period. In fact, it would be of great value to correlate this influence and the attitude toward Josephus with the history of events in England.

ROSTON (3391), pp. 118–120, notes that the growing sanctity of the Hebrew scriptures in England by the end of the sixteenth century led playwrights to turn to the Apocrypha and Josephus in the seventeenth century, which provided Scriptural settings and association without the awkwardness of divine authority. ROSTON, pp. 173–175, surveys the plays based on Josephus during the Restoration period in the late seventeenth century, none of which, he asserts, rise above the mediocre. He also discusses, p. 222, Henry H. Milman's dramatic poem, 'The Fall of Jerusalem', published in 1820 and based on Josephus.

MILLER (3392) notes that the spelling 'Silo's Brook' in Milton's 'Paradise Lost' (1. 11, 3. 29–31) indicates that Milton's probable source was Josephus (War 2. 340, 5. 140, 5. 145), where it is spelled Σιλωά, rather than the Hebrew Bible (Isaiah 8. 6, Nehemiah 3. 15) or the New Testament (John 9. 11). We may comment that this is likely, though, since Milton knew Hebrew well, he may well have known the name as it appears in Isaiah and Nehemiah, where it does not have an *m* at the end but a *h* (Shiloah), which was lightly sounded.

We may here call attention to an interesting and hitherto hardly noticed oddity, which appeared before the turn of the century, WILLIAMS (3393), which claims that Josephus wrote the history of the United States in his 'Life' and that he presents allegorical prophecies, with Josephus himself symbolizing the United States Treasury Department. He uses Josephus to predict that the American monetary system will be destroyed at the end of the exact number of years after 1826 that the ancient Jewish Temple was destroyed after the birth of Jesus (approximately seventy-four years).

ROSENTHAL (3393a), pp. 158–160, comments on the use made of Josephus by Edward Lively in the sixteenth century as a source for Roman history, as well as for the history of the Second Temple, especially in chronology. He also, p. 81, comments on the use of Josephus made by John Rainolds (Reynolds) in the seventeenth century in his treatise on Obadiah and Haggai.

STOLLMAN (3393b) concludes that Josephus is a more important source for Milton than is the Talmud. He notes, for example, that Milton, echoing Josephus but not the Talmud, declares that Samson was tainted with the sin of

pride. He notes, however, that Samson in Milton, contrary to the view of Josephus, has kept his vow of abstinence.

## 27.28: The Herod Theme in English Literature

- (3394) ROSCOE E. PARKER: The Reputation of Herod in Early English Literature. In: *Speculum* 8, 1953, pp. 59–67.
- (3395) MAURICE J. VALENCY: The Tragedies of Herod and Mariamne (Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature, no. 145). New York 1940.
- (3396) S. S. HUSSEY: How Many Herods in the Middle English Drama? In: *Neophilologus* 48, 1964, pp. 252–259.
- (3397) ROBERT WEIMANN: Die furchtbare Komik des Herodes: Dramaturgie und Figurenaufbau des vorshakespeareschen Schurken. In: *Archiv* 204, 1967, pp. 113–123.

The Herod of the medieval plays was so well known for his raging that Shakespeare's Hamlet (3. 2. 14) complains of the type of contemporary actor who "out-Herods Herod". To be sure, the main source of the raving Herod is to be found in the apocryphal Gospels and in the writings of the Church Fathers, as PARKER (3394) has shown; and in the earliest liturgical dramas on Herod there is no distinction between Herod the Great and Herod the Tetrarch, but undoubtedly, we may remark, the portraits in Josephus, which were widely known, were a contributing factor.

VALENCY (3395), after summarizing (pp. 3–38) the story of Herod and Mariamne in Josephus, its influence during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, and the similarity to the situation in Shakespeare's 'Othello', comments on Josephus' anti-Herodian bias, and remarks that the playwrights of the Renaissance read Josephus with the Herod of the Gospel of Matthew before their eyes, and that thus Herod became a tyrant of a Senecan type. Valency then discusses thirty-seven plays in English and other modern literatures on the Herod-Mariamne theme.

HUSSEY (3396) remarks on the confusion in medieval drama of the various Herods – the Great, the Tetrarch, and Agrippa I.

I have not seen WEIMANN (3397).

## 27.29: French Literature

- (3398) MARIE-MADELEINE MOUFLARD: Robert Garnier 1545–1590. Vol. 3: Les Sources. La Roche-sur-Yon 1964.
- (3399) DONALD STONE: Robert Garnier and Josephus Flavius. In: *Harvard Library Bulletin* 20, 1972, pp. 184–187.
- (3400) ÉMILE MIREAUX: La reine Bérénice. Paris 1951.
- (3401) HAVA AVIGDOR: Joseph Flavius et Madame de Sévigné. In: *Revue des Études juives* 127, 1968, pp. 259–264.
- (3402) BERTRAM E. SCHWARZBACH: Voltaire's Old Testament Criticism. Geneva 1971.
- (3402a) NOËMI HEPP: Un anti-héros tiré des 'Antiquités judaïques': Hérode. In: NOËMI HEPP and GEORGES LIVET, edd., *Héroïsme et création littéraire sous les règnes*

d'Henri IV et de Louis XIII. Colloque organisé par le Centre de Philologie et de Littérature romanes de l'Université des Lettres et sciences Humaines de Strasbourg et la Société d'Études du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle le 5 et 6 mai 1972 (Colloques de Strasbourg, Actes et colloques, no. 16). Paris 1974. Pp. 297–311.

MOUFLARD (3398), pp. 184–190, has a detailed discussion of the influence of Josephus, 'Antiquities', Book 10, chapter 11 (= 10. 219–281) on the sixteenth-century Garnier. Josephus, she concludes, was a prime historical source for his 'Juifves', but Garnier contaminated the elements with considerable liberty.

STONE (3399) notes that Garnier himself says that he used chapters 9 and 10 of Book 10 of the 'Antiquities', but that the material actually comes from chapter 11 of our present-day editions. He concludes that Garnier employed an edition which had different chapter divisions, and he notes that Harvard's Houghton Library indeed owns such a French translation by Guillaume Michel printed in 1534.

MIREAUX (3400) discusses the theme of Titus and Berenice in seventeenth-century French literature, notably Segrais (Comtesse de La Fayette), Corneille, Mademoiselle de La Vallière, and Racine.

AVIGDOR (3401) has remarked that one of the seventeenth-century Madame de Sévigné's favorite authors was Josephus, whom she read in the French translation of d'Andilly shortly after it was published in 1667–68. AVIGDOR cites passages from her letters mentioning Josephus, "the most beautiful history in the world".

As to Voltaire in the eighteenth century, SCHWARZBACH (3402) has commented on his scathing essay, 'Juifs', which is more a critique of Josephus than of the Bible.

HEPP (3402a), commenting on the seventeenth-century tragedies on Mariamne in French by Alexandre Hardy and Tristan and on the chapter in 'La cour sainte' by Nicolas Caussin dealing with Mariamne, concludes that the image of the anti-hero Herod is richer in Tristan than in Hardy or in Caussin but also simpler. The treatment, he says, is in a manner appropriate to the epoch of Louis XIII.

### 27.30: Italian Literature

(3403) ERNST R. CURTIUS: *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter*. Bern 1948. Trans. into English by WILLARD R. TRASK: *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. New York 1953.

(3404) PIERRE DE NOLHAC: *Pétrarque et l'humanisme* Paris 1892; 2nd. ed. 1907; rpt. Torino 1959.

(3405) VINCENZO USSANI: *Il Petrarca e Flavio Giuseppe*. In: *Pontificia Accademia romana di archeologia. Rendiconti*. Vol. 20, fasc. 3–4, 1943–44, pp. 447–467.

CURTIUS (3403) notes that the story in Dante (Purgatory 23. 30) of the Jewess Mary who bit into her son during Titus' siege of Jerusalem is taken from Josephus (War 6. 201–213). More likely, we may suggest, it was taken from a

secondary source, since this particular passage was so often quoted by authors from Eusebius and Jerome on down.

Since, as DE NOLHAC (3404), vol. 2, pp. 152–156, has remarked, we possess, with notes from the hand of Petrarch, the translation of the first part of the 'Antiquities' and of 'Against Apion', we are not surprised to discover Petrarch's great indebtedness to Josephus throughout his works.

USSANI (3405) cites many cases of similarity in language between Petrarch and Josephus, often via Peter Comestor, though not, he adds, through Hegesippus.

### 27.31: Spanish Literature

- (3406) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Josephus and His Influence on Spanish Literature. Necrology. In: Romance Philology 17, 1963, p. 20.
- (3407) YAKOV MALKIEL: El libro infinito de M. R. L. de M.: Josefo y su influencia en la literara española. In: Filología 13, 1968–69, pp. 205–226.
- (3408) YAKOV MALKIEL: Preliminary Bibliography of the Writings of María Rosa Lida de Malkiel. In: Romance Philology 17, 1963, pp. 33–52.
- (3409) YAKOV MALKIEL: Supplement to the Preliminary María Rosa Lida de Malkiel Bibliography (Romance Philology XVII, 33–52). In: Romance Philology 20, 1966, pp. 44–52.
- (3410) YAKOV MALKIEL: Bibliografía Analítica Preliminar de los trabajos de María Rosa Lida de Malkiel. In her: La originalidad artistica de 'La Celestina'. 2nd ed., Buenos Aires 1970. Pp. 753–779.
- (3411) YAKOV MALKIEL: Las fuentes de los estudios josefinos de María Rosa Lida de Malkiel. In: Cuadernos del Sur 11, Bahía Blanca, Argentina 1972 (Homenaje a Arturo Marasso). Pp. 9–18.
- (3412) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Le métrica de la Biblia. Un motive de Josefo y de St. Jérónimo en la literatura española. In: Estudios hispánicos, homenaje a Archer M. Huntington. Wellesley, Mass. 1952. Pp. 335–359.
- (3413) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Alejandro en Jerusalén. In: Romance Philology 10, 1956–57, pp. 185–196.
- (3414) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Josefo en la *General Estoria*. In: FRANK PIERCE, ed., Hispanic Studies in Honour of Ignacio Gonzáles Llubera. Oxford 1959. Pp. 163–181.
- (3415) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Datos para la leyenda de Alejandro en la Edad Media castellana. In: Romance Philology 15, 1961–62, pp. 412–423.
- (3416) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL, rev.: GEORGE A. CARY, The Medieval Alexander. In: Romance Philology 15, 1961–62, pp. 311–318.
- (3417) YAKOV and MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: The Jew and the Indian: Traces of a Confusion in the Hispanic Tradition. In: LUCY S. DAWIDOWICZ et al., ed., For Max Weinreich on His Seventieth Birthday. The Hague 1964. Pp. 203–208.
- (3418) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: 'Las infancias de Moisés' y otros tres estudios, en torno al influjo de Josefo en la literatura española. In: Romance Philology 23, 1970, pp. 412–448.
- (3419) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Túbal, primer poblador de España. In: Ábaco (Madrid), no. 3, 1970, pp. 9–48.
- (3420) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Las sectas judías y los 'procuradores' romanos: En torno a Josefo y su influjo sobre la literatura española. In: Hispanic Review 39, 1971, pp. 183–213.

- (3421) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: La dinastía de los Macabeos en Josefo y en la literatura española. In: *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 48, 1971, pp. 289–297.
- (3422) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Lope de Vega y los judíos. In: *Bulletin hispanique* 75, 1973, pp. 73–113.
- (3423) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: En torno a Josefo y su influencia en la literatura española: precursores e inventores. In: *Studia Hispanica in Honorem Rafael Lapesa*. Vol. 1. Madrid 1972. Pp. 15–61.
- (3424) JOHN C. J. METFORD: Tirso de Molina's Old Testament Plays. In: *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies* 27, 1950, pp. 149–163.
- (3425) SISTER FRANCIS GORMLY: The Use of the Bible in Representative Works of Medieval Spanish Literature 1250–1300 (Catholic University of America, Studies in Romance Languages and Literatures, 64). Washington 1962.
- (3426) HELEN NADER: Josephus and Diego Hurtado de Mendoza. In: *Romance Philology* 26, 1972–73, pp. 554–555.
- (3427) ANGELA SELKE: Flavius Josephus among the 'Chuetas' of Mallorca. In: *Romance Philology* 28, 1974, pp. 34–35.
- (3427a) EDWARD GLASER: Alvaro Cubillo de Aragón's "Los desagrazos de Christo". In: *Hispanic Review* 24, 1956, pp. 306–321.
- (3427b) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Jerusalén. El tema literario de su cerco y destrucción por los romanos. Buenos Aires 1972.
- (3427c) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: La tradición clásica en España. Barcelona 1975.

The only area of Josephus' influence that has been explored systematically is that of Spanish literature; but while a number of portions of LIDA DE MALKIEL's massive (1000 pages in typescript) but unfinished work have been published, some of them posthumously, her survey (3406) of the subject remains in manuscript. Its scope, to judge from her husband's (3407) description, is broad.

MALKIEL (3408) has a preliminary bibliography of his late wife's work, several items of which deal with Josephus' influence on Spanish literature. He has supplemented this (3409)(3410). MALKIEL (3411) discusses both the work of his late wife on Josephus' influence which has appeared and that which still remains in manuscript.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3412) has traced the influence of Josephus' statements (Ant. 2. 346, 4. 303) that the Bible contains poetry by Moses in hexameters and by David in trimeters and pentameters (Ant. 7. 305) through Eusebius, Jerome (who adds Job), Isidore (where it serves to defend the spiritual value of poetry), the Spanish writers of the Renaissance, and the eighteenth-century Spanish Benito Feijóo y Montenegro, who uses it to prove that it is proper for poetry to deal with facts, not fiction.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3413) comments on the influence in French and medieval Spanish literature of the motif of Alexander the Great's sparing of Jerusalem at the instance of the high priest. In particular, she assesses the motive that led to variations in emphasis.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3414), in a compactly written and extensively documented article, points out the particular aspects of Josephus' appraisal of history which attracted Alfonso the Learned, the author of the 'General Estoria', who strives mightily to harmonize Josephus and the Bible, namely his interest in psychological motivation, his didacticism, his novelistic presentation of Biblical



episodes, and his rationalistic explanations of supernatural events. She notes that Alfonso, in contrast to his defensive attitude toward Arabic sources, treats Josephus with such respect that he sometimes prefers him to Eusebius and Jerome. Much of Josephus' influence, however, we may note, is via Peter Comestor.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3415), and in a review article (3416) of CARY, whose work she admires, supplements it with details about the Alexander legend in Spain during the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3417) suggests that the context of *Against Apion* 1. 179, where Aristotle is quoted by Clearchus of Soli as saying that the Jews are descended from the Indian philosophers, may have been responsible for the confusion in the Spanish tradition between the Jew and the Indian, since both qualified for the role of Oriental sage. The equation of Jew = philosopher = Indian, we may add, has a tradition outside Josephus, in Megasthenes (ap. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 1. 15) and Theophrastus (ap. Porphyry, *De Abstinencia ab Esu Animalium* 2. 26).

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3418) has studies of the influence on Spanish literature of Josephus' descriptions of the infancy of Moses (*Ant.* 2. 217–237), the pillars erected by the descendants of Seth (*Ant.* 1. 70–71), the meeting of Alexander and the high priest (*Ant.* 11. 329–339), and the scandalous deceit practiced on Paulina (*Ant.* 18. 65–80).

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3419) discusses the influence of Josephus' tradition (*Ant.* 1. 124) on Isidore of Seville and later Spanish historians that Theobel (Biblical Tubal), the son of Japheth the son of Noah, founded the Theobelians, later called the Iberians. She also discusses the influence of Megasthenes' statement, as quoted by Josephus (*Ant.* 10. 227 = *Against Apion* 1. 144), that Nebuchadnezzar subdued the greater part of Libya and of Iberia.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3420) discusses the influence of Josephus' portrait of the four sects and of the procurators, especially Pontius Pilate, on Spanish literature, notably on 'El caballero Zifar', Antonio de Guevara's sixteenth-century '*Libro aureo de Marco Aurelio*', Diego de Hojeda's seventeenth-century '*La Cristiada*', and Gabriel Miro's twentieth-century '*Las figuras de la Pasión del Señor*'.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3421) discusses the influence of Josephus' account of the Hasmoneans on Alfonso the Learned in his '*General Estoria*', Fermán Pérez de Guzmán, Guillem de Cervera, Pero Mejía, Fray Bartolomé de las Casas, Sebastian de Covarrubras, Bernardo J. Aldrete, Lope de Vega, and Fray Pedro Ribadeneira.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (3422) discusses the influence of Josephus on Lope de Vega.

I have not seen LIDA DE MALKIEL's (3423) latest posthumous work.

METFORD (3424) has written a good article on the three surviving Tirso plays on Biblical subjects (Ruth, Jezebel, and Tamar), his selective use of Josephus, his character-drawing and the emphasis he gives to female types. He notes also that Tirso's '*La Vida de Herodes*' drew the plot directly from Josephus, shows that Tirso knew both the '*War*' and the '*Antiquities*', and cites his use of Josephus as a guide to dating Tirso's plays.

GORMLY (3425), pp. 30–32, in her survey, is dependent on LIDA DE MALKIEL. In particular, she notes that the 'General Estoria' of Alfonso the Learned, which she calls, together with Peter Comestor, the structural source of Spanish Biblical history, is endlessly indebted to Josephus, either directly or indirectly through Peter Comestor's 'Historia Scholastica'.

NADER (3426) argues that the sixteenth-century Diego in his 'De la guerra de Granada' used Josephus' 'War' as his model. She notes no specific parallels but rather the similarity between Diego and Josephus as witnesses who were notable for their divided sympathies. She says that both men were committed to their own empires while being sympathetic with the rebels against the Romans. In general, we may conclude, the parallels are too vague to be convincing.

SELKE (3427) notes that in late seventeenth-century Mallorca Josephus, in a Castilian translation, appears to have been the main source, next to the Bible, from which the so-called Chuetas (descendants of Jews who were forcibly converted to Christianity but who secretly maintained their Judaism) derived their knowledge of Jewish ancient history.

GLASER (3427a) notes that critics have overlooked one of the key figures, Josephus, in Alvaro Cubillo de Aragón's 'Los desagrazios de Christo', a dramatization of Jerusalem's destruction by Vespasian and Titus written in 1640, which went through no fewer than eight editions during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Through Josephus' intervention this *comedia* comes close to being a dramatized Christian apologetic. Josephus' popularity in Spain, says GLASER, stems from a sustained contemporary interest in historiography and from his being the most accessible writer on Judaism. To this we may add the fact that the numerous Spanish Conversos (the so-called Marranos), who practiced their Judaism secretly after their conversion in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, found in Josephus an author whom the Church accepted because of the 'Testimonium Flavianum' and who yet took pride in his Judaism. Cubillo's portrait of Josephus is, however, superficial and drawn entirely according to Spanish taste.

I have not seen LIDA DE MALKIEL (3427b) (3427c).

### 27.32: The Miscellaneous Influence of Josephus: the 'Josephus Problem' in Mathematics

- (3428) PETER G. TAIT: On the Generalization of Josephus' Problem. In: Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh 22, 1897–99, pp. 165–168.
- (3429) WILHELM AHRENS: Das 'Josephusspiel', ein arithmetisches Kunststück; Geschichte und Literatur. In: Archiv für Kulturgeschichte 11, 1913, pp. 129–151.
- (3430) DIRK KUIJPER: De manufacturierster en het negervraagstuk. In: Hermeneus 42, 1970, pp. 33–40.

One of the famous questions in mathematics, as we see in TAIT (3428), is to calculate how Josephus managed to save himself and a companion out of a total of forty-one men when the majority had resolved on self-destruction (War 3. 387–391). This problem has had a long history, as we see in AHRENS (3429).

The latest to deal with it, KUIJPER (3430), discusses a poem in the 'Poetae Latini Minores', 5 (Leipzig 1883), pp. 370–372 (BAEHREND'S), and connects it with Hegesippus 3. 15–18, as well as with 'War' 3. 387 and 391.

### 27.33: Censorship of Josephus

(3430a) MOSHE CARMILLY-WEINBERGER: *Censorship and Freedom of Expression in Jewish History*. New York 1977.

CARMILLY-WEINBERGER (3430a), pp. 206–208, cites, as an example of censorship of a work on Josephus, Johannes Baptista Ottius, 'Specilegium sive excerpta ex Flavio Josepho ad Novi Testamenti illustrationem' (Amsterdam, 1726), which was banned in 1743.

### 27.34: The Influence of Josephus on Art and Music

(3431) JOSEPH GUTMANN: The Haggadic Motif in Jewish Iconography. In *Erez-Israel* 6, 1960, pp. \*16–\*22.

(3432) ANONYMOUS: Josephus Flavius: In the Arts. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 263–264.

(3433) ANONYMOUS: Herod I: In the Arts. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 385–386.

(3434) BATHJA BAYER: Herod I: In Music. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 8, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 386–387.

(3435) ANONYMOUS: Titus, Flavius Vespasianus: In the Arts. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1170–1171.

(3436) ANONYMOUS: Temple: In the Arts. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 984–986.

(3437) BEZALEL NARKISS: Temple Implements in Illuminated Manuscripts. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 986–987.

(3438) BEZALEL NARKISS: Jerusalem: In Art. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 9, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1578–1589.

(3438a) KURT WEITZMANN: Zur Frage des Einflusses Jüdischer Bilderquellen auf die Illustration des Alten Testaments. In: *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband 1*, Münster 1964 (= *Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser*), pp. 401–415. Trans. into English: The Question of the Influence of Jewish Pictorial Sources on Old Testament Illustration. In: JOSEPH GUTMANN, ed., *No Graven Images: Studies in Art and the Hebrew Bible*. New York 1971. Pp. 79–95.

(3438b) KURT WEITZMANN: Book Illustration of the Fourth Century: Tradition and Innovation. In: *Akten des VII. Internationalen Kongresses für christliche Archäologie*, Trier, 5–11. September 1965. Rome 1969. Pp. 257–281.

(3438c) KURT WEITZMANN: The Study of Byzantine Book Illumination, Past, Present, and Future. In: KURT WEITZMANN et al., *The Place of Book Illumination in Byzantine Art*. Princeton 1975. Pp. 1–60.

(3438d) CARL-OTTO NORDSTRÖM: Rabbinic Features in Byzantine and Catalan Art. In: *Cahiers archéologiques* 15, 1965, pp. 179–205.

- (3438e) CARL-OTTO NORDSTRÖM: Herod the Great in Two Beatus Miniatures. In: J. BERMAN et al., edd., *Studies in the History of Religions: Supplements to Numen*, 21–22 (= *Ex Orbe Religionum: Studia Geo Widengren*). Vol. 1, Leiden 1972, pp. 245–253.
- (3438f) GUY NAPHTALI DEUTSCH: *Iconographie de l'illustration de Flavius Josèphe au temps de Jean Fouquet*. Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1978.
- (3439) BATHJA BAYER: Jerusalem: In Music. In *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 9, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1589–1591.

GUTMANN (3431) notes the influence of Josephus' account of the Egyptian princess Thermuthis (*Ant.* 2. 224) and of the test of Moses (*Ant.* 2. 233) on Christian miniatures in manuscripts of the twelfth through the fourteenth centuries.

An ANONYMOUS (3432) article in the *Encyclopaedia Judaica* has a brief survey of the depictions of Josephus in sculpture and in paintings in manuscripts of his works, as well as his influence on Renaissance masters who were inspired by him in their effort to evoke the glory of Rome. A systematic treatment remains to be done.

Another ANONYMOUS (3433) article summarizes the depiction of Herod in drama and art; and BAYER (3434) has supplemented this with a rather considerable listing of the influence of the theme of Herod in music, noting briefly some of the factors leading to the popularity of certain motifs.

Another ANONYMOUS (3435) article surveys the influence of Josephus' descriptions of Titus and of the fall of Jerusalem and the burning of the Temple on art and music.

In the many depictions of the Temple and of Jerusalem Josephus is usually a major source, though the ANONYMOUS (3436) survey in the '*Encyclopaedia Judaica*' does not indicate this. There is similar influence of Josephus in the depiction of the Temple implements in illuminated manuscripts, though this is not noted by NARKISS' (3437) otherwise comprehensive survey. NARKISS (3438) has also surveyed the depiction of Jerusalem in art, where Josephus' influence is manifest.

WEITZMANN (3438a) notes that Josephus (*Ant.* 2. 264) is the source of the illustration in the twelfth-century Vatican Octateuch of Moses being brought as a child to the throne of Pharaoh and running into his open arms. So close is the relationship between Josephus and this picture that WEITZMANN postulates an earlier illustrated manuscript of Josephus as a source. He notes that the same passage in Josephus is a source of the miniature in the sixth-century Cotton Genesis now in the British Museum and of an English twelfth-century miniature in the Morgan Library in New York. Again, in the ninth-century miniature of the '*Sacra Parallela*' of John of Damascus, the fact that Agag is depicted as being executed not by Samuel as in the Septuagint but by an executioner is explained by the influence of Josephus (*Ant.* 6. 244), who says that Samuel commanded that Agag be put to death, implying that he himself, being a Nazirite, did not do it himself. Similarly, the next miniature depicts the persecution of the priests of Baal by the Israelites in accordance with Josephus' version (*Ant.* 8. 343), in contrast to the statement in the Septuagint that it was done by

Elijah. Again, the portrayal of the crucifixion of Pharaoh's baker on the pendentive of one of the narthex cupolas of the cathedral of St. Mark in Venice is taken from Josephus (Ant. 2. 73).

WEITZMANN (3438b) deals briefly with illustrations in miniatures in manuscripts of Josephus. He connects this innovation in the fourth century with the replacement of the roll by the codex, where the isolated composition can develop itself.

I have not seen WEITZMANN (3438c). [See *infra*, p. 973.]

NORDSTRÖM (3438d) notes that extra-Biblical features which are found in Josephus (Ant. 10. 232) but which are not in Daniel 5. 31 influenced the depiction in a miniature in the Ripoll Bible. Other details agree with Herodotus' description (1. 180–185) of Babylon's position and defences and its conquest by Cyrus; but since Herodotus was at the time available only in Greek and since Herodotus' points are mentioned by Josephus, NORDSTRÖM considers it more likely that the illustration took its origin from one source, the Latin Josephus, rather than from two, although he admits that this account must have been supplemented in some details which are not in Josephus and which ultimately derive from Herodotus.

NORDSTRÖM (3438e) notes a number of instances of the influence of an illustrated copy of Josephus' works. In particular, the portrayal in the manuscripts in Gerona near Barcelona, one dating from 975 and the other from about 1100, of a servant holding a knife with an apple on its point while Herod is lying in bed is derived from Josephus' account of Herod's attempt to commit suicide (Ant. 17. 183–184 and War 1. 662). Again, the depiction of Herod with his genitals exposed alludes to Josephus' description of his suffering from his terrible disease (Ant. 17. 168–169 and War 1. 656). The portrayal, moreover, of Herod as a horseman is taken from War 1. 347ff. and Antiquities 14. 468ff.; but, we may object, there is no specific mention of Herod as a horseman.

DEUTSCH (3438f) recounts the history of the illustrations of the text of Josephus through the period of Fouquet in the fifteenth century, with particular attention given to the iconography of eleven miniatures illustrating a translation of Josephus in the Bibliothèque Nationale. [See *infra*, p. 974.]

In music inspired by the theme of Jerusalem one may likewise assume the influence of Josephus, though this is not noted by BAYER (3439).

### 27.35: The Influence of the Slavonic Version of the 'War'

(3440) DIMITRIJ TSCIŽEWSKIJ: *Geschichte der altrussischen Literatur im 11., 12. und 13. Jahrhundert*, Kiever Epoche. Frankfurt 1948.

(3441) NIKOLAI K. GUDZII: *History of Early Russian Literature* (trans. from the 2nd Russian ed. by SUSAN W. JONES). New York 1949.

(3442) ADOLF STENDER-PETERSEN: *Den russiske litteraturs historie I–II*. Copenhagen 1952. Trans. into German by WILHELM KRÄMER: *Geschichte der russischen Literatur*. Vol. 1. München 1957.

(3443) B. ST. ANGELOV: *Josephus Flavius in South Slavic Literature* (in Russian). In: *Trudy otdela Drevnerusskoj Literatury* 19, 1963, pp. 255–261.

- (3444) M. I. MULIĆ: A Reflection of the History of the Jewish War of Josephus Flavius in Old Serbian Literature (in Russian). In: *Trudy otdela drevnej russkoj literatury* 24, 1969, pp. 108–111.

TSCHIZĖWSKIJ (3440) discusses the influence of the language of the Slavonic Josephus on medieval Russian literature and especially (pp. 313–314) on Russian chronicles and (pp. 355–358) on the 'Tale of Igor's Expedition'.

GUDZII (3441), pp. 57–63, notes the influence of the style of the Slavonic Josephus on Russian narrative literature of the martial type down to the seventeenth century, especially the 'Tale of Igor's Expedition', and, pp. 222–224, on the battle formulae in the thirteenth-century 'Galician Chronicle'.

STENDER-PETERSEN (3442), pp. 91–96, is particularly concerned with the importance of the Slavonic Josephus and its influence on Russian literature. He notes, in particular (p. 149) its influence on 'The Life of Alexander Nevskij' and (p. 200) on 'The Campaign of Stefan Batoryi'.

I have not seen ANGELOV (3443).

MULIĆ (3444) concludes that it was a Russian translation of Josephus' 'War' which greatly influenced fourteenth-century Serbian literature.

### 27.36: The Influence of Josippon

- (3445) Y. LAINER: On Josephus and His Books in Rabbinic Literature (in Hebrew). In: SAMUEL K. MIRSKY, ed., *Sura. Jerusalem 1953–54*. Pp. 428–438.
- (3446) JACOB REINER: The Original Hebrew Yosippon in the Chronicle of Jerahmeel. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 60, 1969–70, pp. 128–146.
- (3447) ARIEL TOAFF, rev.: JACOB REINER, *The English Yosippon*. In: *Rassegna Mensile di Israel* 34, 1968, pp. 306–307.
- (3448) JACOB REINER: *The English Yosippon*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58, 1967–68, pp. 126–142.
- (3449) DOUGLAS M. DUNLOP: *The History of the Jewish Khazars*. Princeton 1954.
- (3450) ISRAEL J. KAZIS, ed. and trans.: *The Book of the Gestes of Alexander of Macedon, Sefer Toledot Alexandros ha-Makdoni; a mediaeval Hebrew version of the Alexander romance by Immanuel ben Jacob Bonfils*. Cambridge, Mass. 1962.
- (3451) GERSON D. COHEN, ed.: *The Book of Tradition (Sefer ha-Qabbalah) by Abraham ibn Daud*. Philadelphia 1967.
- (3452) DAVID FLUSSER: An 'Alexander Geste' in a Parma MS. (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 26, 1956–57, pp. 165–184.
- (3453) YITZHAK BAER: *The Book of Josippon the Jew* (in Hebrew). In: *Sefer Ben Zion Dina-burg. Jerusalem 1949*. Pp. 178–205.
- (3454) ARIEL TOAFF: Sorrento e Pozzuoli nella letteratura ebraica del Medioevo. In: *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 40, 1965, pp. 313–317.
- (3455) GIORGIO R. CARDONA: I nomi dei figli di Tögermäh secondo il Sēpher Yôsēphôn. In: *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 41, 1966, pp. 17–28.
- (3456) ARIEL TOAFF: La storia di Zephò e la guerra tra Angias e Turno nello Josephon. In: *Annuario di Studi Ebraici* 3, 1963–64, pp. 41–46.
- (3457) DAVID FLUSSER: Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 122–132.

- (3457a) ERWIN I. J. ROSENTHAL: *Studia Semitica*, vol. 1 (University of Cambridge Oriental Publications, no. 16). Cambridge 1971.
- (3457b) MARTIN A. COHEN, ed., *Samuel Usque, Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel* (trans. from the Portuguese). Philadelphia 1965 [1964].
- (3457c) DAN BEN-AMOS, introduction, in: MICHA JOSEPH BIN GORION (BERDYCZEWSKI), *Mimekor Yisrael: Classical Jewish Folktales*, vol. 1 (trans. by I. M. LASK). Bloomington 1976. Pp. xlv–xlvi.

LAINER (3445), in a discursive article, has an uncritical collection of references to Josephus (actually Josippon) in the great rabbis of the Middle Ages and modern times. From the fact that the Talmudic rabbis did not include Josephus in their listing of books that ought not to be read, he argues that they thought his works worthy to be read. He does not realize that Josippon is a medieval compilation and that there is no indication anywhere that Josephus' version in Hebrew or Aramaic (War 1. 3) was at all known; hence the Rabbis may have found the work too unimportant to ban. He resolves the contradiction between Josephus' laudatory appraisal of Titus and the Rabbis' condemnation of him by asserting that the Rabbis had superior inspiration.

REINER (3446) accepts Saadia Gaon's commentary on Daniel as authentic and thus regards the reference in the latter to Joseph ben Gorion (Josippon) as indicating that he had used the work prior to 942, the date of Saadia's death. REINER also notes that the twelfth-century Jerahmeel closely parallels the Mantua edition of Josippon.

TOAFF (3447) notes that REINER (3448) omits the name of the eleventh-century Rabbi Nathan ben Jehiel of Rome from the list of those who used Josippon.

REINER (3448) concludes that Morvvyng's translation of Josippon into English should be classified with anti-Jewish literature of seventeenth-century England opposing Jewish resettlement. We may comment, however, that the translation was made in 1558; and its composition can hardly be connected with the controversy which surrounded the question of whether Jews should be allowed to re-enter England under Cromwell in 1655, though, of course, it was used by those who opposed their re-entry.

DUNLOP (3449), pp. 162–163, concludes that the stylistic and factual dependence on Josippon of a twelfth-century Cambridge document from the Geniza which gives an account of the conversion of the Khazars to Judaism can hardly be said to be established.

KAZIS (3450), pp. 28–31, notes that the Hebrew version of the Alexander Romance, translated from the Latin in the fourteenth century by Immanuel ben Jacob Bonfils, is based on Josippon. KAZIS summarizes the scholarly view on the nature of this dependence and concludes that the account in Josephus of these common traditions is fuller, more detailed, and, in some instances, more accurate. KAZIS, pp. 203–204, lists the elements in the Hebrew Alexander Romance derived from Josippon but adds nothing of his own to the scholarly discussion.

COHEN (3451), pp. xxxiii–xxxv, notes that Josippon was one of Ibn Daud's major sources and is able to discern that the version which he used was

akin to the one later printed in Constantinople. He asserts, however, that FLUSSER's (3452) thesis that Ibn Daud's Josippon already had the interpolation on the life of Alexander deriving from the 'Historia de Preliis' cannot be proven. COHEN, pp. 171, 221–222, also contests BAER's (3453) theory that Ibn Daud wrote his work to correct Josippon's unorthodox views, since he follows Josippon slavishly against rabbinic tradition.

TOAFF (3454) traces the confusion of Sorrento and Pozzuoli, as found in the twelfth-century Benjamin of Tudela, back to Josippon.

CARDONA (3455) notes the close correspondence between the enumeration of the sons of Togarmah, the son of Gomer and grandson of Japheth, the son of Noah, in Josippon and in the twelfth-century chronicle of Jeraḥmeel.

TOAFF (3456), commenting on the story of Zepho ben Eliphaz, the grandson of Esau, in Josippon, notes the parallel between his account of Angias king of Carthage and Turnus king of Benevento and the thirteenth-century 'Sefer ha-Yashar', which had Josippon and some other apocryphal text as a source.

FLUSSER (3457) has noted the interesting fact that the first prime minister of the modern state of Israel, according to a statement which he made to FLUSSER himself, changed his name from David Gruen to Ben-Gurion, deriving his name from the reputed author of Josippon.

ROSENTHAL (3457a) remarks that the otherwise good historical sense of the fifteenth-century Jewish Biblical exegete Abrabanel failed him in that he takes Josippon as a historical source in a strict sense. He notes also that the sixteenth-century Edward Lively distinguished between Josephus and Josippon.

COHEN (3457b) notes that the sixteenth-century Jewish Converso (Marrano) historian Usque relies heavily on Josippon, especially in Dialogue II of his 'Consolation', which traces the history of the Jews from the destruction of the First to the destruction of the Second Temple.

BEN-AMOS (3457c) notes the great debt of BIN GORION to Josippon, especially in his stories about Alexander the Great. The stories themselves, we may remark, are given in popular form with only rare indication of source and with few critical notes.

### 27.37: The Influence of the Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon

(3458) GEORG GRAF: *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur*. Vol. 1. Vatican City 1944.

(3459) WALTER J. FISCHEL: *Ibn Khaldūn and Josippon*. In: *Homenaje a Millás-Vallicrosa*. Vol. 1. Barcelona 1954. Pp. 587–598. Abridged and revised in his: *Ibn Khaldun in Egypt*. Berkeley 1967. Pp. 139–144.

(3460) AARON Z. AEŠCOLY: *A Lost Chapter of the Hebrew Chronicle (in Hebrew)*. In: *Tarbiẓ* 5, 1934, pp. 341–349.

(3461) AARON Z. AEŠCOLY: *Die äthiopische Übersetzung eines Kapitels aus einer verlorenen hebräischen Chronik*. In: *Orientalia* 6, 1937, pp. 101–115.

The influence of the tenth-century Arabic version of Josippon, which was widely used by Moslem historians and by Christians in Egypt, has never been systematically traced.



GRAF (3458), pp. 221–223, discusses the influence of the Arabic version on Coptic literature.

FISCHEL (3459) notes that the fourteenth-century Ibn Khaldun, whom he calls the “Toynbee of the Arabs”, used Josippon in the Arabic version and reproduced almost verbatim nearly all the chapters dealing with the post-Biblical period until the destruction of the Second Temple.

The Ethiopic version, which was made from the Arabic some time between the twelfth and fourteenth centuries, was highly regarded by the Ethiopic Church, which thus knew of the content of II Maccabees, one of Josippon's sources which was probably unknown to Josephus himself. The influence of the version has, however, never been systematically studied.

AEŠCOLY (3460)(3461) demonstrates that an important ethnographic fragment of the Ethiopic work called the ‘Book of the Mysteries of the Heavens and the Earth’, which is much venerated in Ethiopia, is merely a chapter from the Ethiopic version of Josippon. He also notes the relationship of this fragment, which describes the countries founded by the descendants of Noah, with the ‘Sefer ha-Yashar’ and Jeraḥmeel (to which we may add Pseudo-Philo's ‘Biblical Antiquities’). AEŠCOLY notes that the lack of a critical text of the ‘Book of the Mysteries of the Heavens and the Earth’, which exists in only one manuscript, impedes the identification of the names.

## 28: Josephus' Influence on Modern Contemporary Literature

### 28.0: The Influence of Josephus on Modern Fiction: General

- (3462) ANONYMOUS: Josephus Flavius: In the Arts. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 263–264.
- (3463) ANONYMOUS: Titus, Flavius Vespasianus: In the Arts. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1170–1171.
- (3464) ANONYMOUS: Temple: In the Arts. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 15, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 984–986.
- (3465) ANONYMOUS: Jerusalem: In Literature. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 9, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 1577–1578.

The 'Encyclopaedia Judaica' (3462) very briefly traces the influence of Josephus on modern fiction.

A second article (3463) includes the influence both of Josephus' portrayal of Titus and of the Roman assault on Jerusalem in modern fiction. Other articles (3464)(3465) survey the influence of the Temple and of Jerusalem on literature, where the influence of Josephus' descriptions is manifest, though it is not mentioned by the anonymous authors.

### 28.1: Modern Fiction: FEUCHTWANGER

- (3466) LION FEUCHTWANGER: *Josephus; Roman-Trilogie*. Frankfurt a.M. 1952.
- (3467) LION FEUCHTWANGER: *Der jüdische Krieg* (vol. 1 of his trilogy). Berlin 1932. Trans. into English by WILLA and EDWIN MUIR: *Josephus*. New York 1932, 1943. Trans. into French by MAURICE RÉMON: *La guerre des juifs*. Paris 1933. Trans. into Italian by ERVINO POCAR: *La Fine di Gerusalemme*. Milano 1933. Trans. into Polish by LEO BELMONT. Warsaw 1933. Trans. into Hebrew. Tel-Aviv 1944. Trans. into Rumanian. Bucharest 1945. Trans. into Czech by P. JARIN. Bratislava 1949.
- (3468) LION FEUCHTWANGER: *Die Söhne* (vol. 2 of his trilogy). Amsterdam, Stockholm 1935. Trans. into English by WILLA and EDWIN MUIR: *The Jew of Rome*. London 1935, New York 1936. Trans. into Czech by FRANTIŠEK SCLEPA. Praha 1935. Trans. into Hungarian by LÁSZLÓ DORMÁND. Budapest 1935. Trans. into Norwegian by ALF HARBITZ. Oslo 1935. Trans. into French by MAURICE RÉMON: *Le Juif de Rome*. Paris 1936.
- (3469) LION FEUCHTWANGER: *Der Tag wird kommen* (vol. 3 of his trilogy). Stockholm 1945, Rudolstadt 1951. Trans. into English by CAROLINE ORAM: *Josephus and the Emperor*. New York 1942. Trans into Italian by ERVINO POCAR: *Il Giorno Verrà*. Milano 1948.
- (3470) LION FEUCHTWANGER: *Der jüdische Krieg. Der Roman trilogie Josephus, w przekładzie polskim JACKA FRÜLINGA, WOJNA ŻYDOWSKA*, 3 vols. Warsaw 1959.

- (3471) LION FEUCHTWANGER: *The Jewish War: A Novel* (Trans. into Russian of the first volume of FEUCHTWANGER's trilogy. Moscow 1937).
- (3472) LION FEUCHTWANGER: *La guerra de los Judíos. Vida de Flavio Josepho. Novela. Versión castellana de Aarón Spivak* (Biblioteca Israel. Ser. 1939, no. 5–6). Buenos Aires 1939; 2nd ed. 1946.
- (3473) GEORG (GYÖRGY) LUKÁCS: *Essays über Realismus*. Berlin 1948.
- (3474) WERNER JAHN: *Die Geschichtsauffassung Lion Feuchtwangers in seiner Josephus-Trilogie*. Rudolstadt 1954.
- (3475) KLAUS WEISSENBERGER: *Flavius Josephus – A Jewish Archetype*. In: JOHN M. SPALEK, ed., *Lion Feuchtwanger: The Man, His Ideas, His Work: A Collection of Critical Essays* (University of Southern California Studies in Comparative Literature, 3). Los Angeles 1972. Pp. 187–199.
- (3475a) KARL THIEME: *Lion Feuchtwangers 'Josephus'. Wahrheit und Verirrung eines historischen Romans*. In: *Freiburger Rundbrief* 10, 1957–58, pp. 25–27.
- (3475b) MARC L. RAPHAEL: *An Ancient and Modern Identity Crisis: Lion Feuchtwanger's 'Josephus' Trilogy*. In: *Judaism* 21, 1972, pp. 409–414.

By far the most popular novels based on Josephus have been the three by FEUCHTWANGER (1884–1958), 'Der jüdische Krieg', published in 1932; 'Die Söhne', published in 1935; and 'Der Tag wird kommen', published in 1945. These have been republished as a trilogy (3466) and translated into several languages in whole or in part (3467)(3468)(3469)(3470)(3471)(3472).

LUKÁCS (3473), pp. 109–112, adopting a Marxist stance, says that Feuchtwanger, in the second novel of his trilogy, is criticizing his own first novel as to ideology and moral problems.

JAHN (3474), pp. 51–55, similarly adopting the Marxist method, concludes that Feuchtwanger's understanding of history comes very close to historical materialism, but that he did not draw the final consequences of this approach.

WEISSENBERGER (3475) remarks that Feuchtwanger saw Josephus as a citizen of the world combining Roman and Jewish culture and as the prophet of East-West rapport. Yet his cosmopolitan mission proved a two-edged sword which at decisive moments turned against his own people. WEISSENBERGER suggests that Feuchtwanger's trilogy actually relates to his own time, that Nazi Germany is alluded to, for example, in the person of the Emperor Domitian, and that the failure of Josephus' enlightened cosmopolitan idealism caused a major revision of Feuchtwanger's own ideal. The novels, we may further suggest, are largely autobiographical, with Josephus representing Feuchtwanger himself, the enlightened and divided Jew of the twentieth century.

Starting with the second volume of his trilogy Feuchtwanger increasingly betrays a Marxist point of view. We may comment that there is no indication in Josephus' latest works, the 'Antiquities', 'Against Apion', and the 'Life' that Josephus became any less committed to the Roman point of view; on the contrary, a major point of the last is precisely Josephus' conviction that the revolt against Rome was foolhardy.

THIEME (3475a), in a review of Feuchtwanger's 'Josephus', remarks that the author has placed twentieth-century characters in the first century.

RAPHAEL (3475b) perceptively remarks that Feuchtwanger used the past as his vehicle for commenting on the present, namely the struggle for identity that

gripped Germany's Jews after World War I. His trilogy reflects Feuchtwanger's own dilemma, as to whether to choose parochialism and Judaism or Germany and world citizenship. It is Feuchtwanger's contention that the road to world citizenship can be paved only through parochialism. The nationalism of Josephus, he argues, does not seek to consolidate itself but to dissipate itself, for true nationalism is cosmopolitan. The Jewish nationalism of Josephus longs to become part of a united world, a world which accepts Judaism and its faith. There are no other roads to world citizenship, Feuchtwanger concludes, except through the wisdom of the Jews. Perhaps, suggests RAPHAEL, by substituting Roman for German, Feuchtwanger is describing Stefan Zweig. Feuchtwanger concludes that Josephus had sought the world but that he had found only his own land, for he had sought the world too soon.

### 28.2: Contemporary Novels about Herod

- (3476) ERNESTUS J. CLAES: *Herodes* (De Blauwe snoeckjes. Kunstsnoeckjes-reeks, nr. 1). Gent 1942.
- (3477) JACOB WEINSHALL: *Herod My Brother* (in Hebrew). Rishon LeZion 1960.
- (3478) PÄR FABIAN LAGERKVIST: *Mariamne*. Stockholm 1967. Trans. into English by NAOMI WALFORD: *Mariamne: A Novel*. London 1968.
- (3479) FRANK G. SLAUGHTER: *The Sins of Herod: A Novel of Rome and the Early Church*. Garden City 1968.

CLAES (3476) has written a novel about Herod in Flemish, which I have been unable to read.

WEINSHALL (3477) has written a novel about Herod in Hebrew.

LAGERKVIST (3478) probes the unbridgeable differences between Mariamne and Herod, who is depicted as a symbol of mankind that replenishes the earth but who will some day be erased from it without a memorial.

SLAUGHTER's (3479) novel is based largely on Josephus and on the New Testament.

### 28.3: Contemporary Novels about Masada

- (3480) YITZHAK HERZBERG: *Masada: A Tale of Jewish Heroism* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1949.
- (3481) YEḤEZKEL FREILICH: *Masada and Rome* (trans. into Hebrew from Yiddish). Tel-Aviv 1962.
- (3482) ERNEST K. GANN: *The Antagonists*. New York 1970. Reissued as: *Masada*. New York 1981.
- (3483) DAVID KOSSOFF: *The Voices of Masada*. London 1973.

HERZBERG (3480) has written a novel based on the history of the war against Rome and its dramatic climax at Masada.

FREILICH (3481) has written an historical novel on Josephus' later life, focussing on Masada.

GANN (3482) has composed a novel about Masada which takes such liberties as asserting that there were clusters of every sect at Masada and that there were times when Eleazar ben Jair despaired of uniting them.

KOSSOFF (3483) has composed a highly imaginative, romanticized version of the Masada story, as though told by the two women who survived the mass suicide.

## 28.4: Other Modern Fiction

(3483a) NAFTALI NE'EMAN: *Between Him and His People* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1956–57.

(3484) KAY BEE: *The Trial of Josephus*. London 1959.

(3485) LEON KOLB: *Berenice, Princess of Judea*. New York 1959.

(3486) LEON KOLB: *Mission to Claudius: A Novel of the Most Fascinating Years of the First Century, A.D.* San Francisco 1963.

(3487) OTTO MAJOR: *Tibériási Justus Emlékezése Életére, Agrippa Királyra, A Nagy Háborúra, Nepe Szenvedésére, A Szétsóratásra, Vitája Josephusszal, Titus Flavius Vespasianus, Udvari Történetírójaval.* (= Justus of Tiberias; *Memoirs of His Life, of King Agrippa, of the Great War, of His People's Sufferings and Dispersion, His Debate with Josephus, Court Historian of Titus Flavius Vespasianus*). Budapest 1965.

(3487a) HOWARD M. FAST: *Agrippa's Daughter*. Garden City 1964. Trans. into Hebrew by URIEL SHELAH. Tel-Aviv 1966.

(3487b) DANIEL GAVRON: *The End of Days: A Novel of the Jewish War against Rome 66–73 C.E.* Philadelphia 1970.

(3487c) MATTHEW FINCH: *A Fox Called Flavius*. London 1974.

NE'EMAN (3483a) has written a fictionalized biography of Josephus based on the 'Life' and the 'War'.

BEE (3484), in a historical novel which is unreliable in factual background, contains a fictitious dialogue which attempts to vindicate Josephus.

The first half of KOLB's (3485) novel about Agrippa II's sister Berenice deals with the great Jewish revolt against Rome.

KOLB (3486) has composed a fanciful novel depicting the mission of Berenice to the Emperor Claudius.

MAJOR (3487) has written a fictionalized version of the life of Justus of Tiberias, focussing on Agrippa II, the great rebellion against Rome, the sufferings of the Jews, and especially Justus' debate with Josephus.

FAST (3487a) has written a lively novel in which one of the minor characters is Josephus.

GAVRON (3487b), in his novel, stresses the power and intensity of Messianic belief as a background for the understanding of the history of the Jewish war against Rome.

FINCH (3487c) has a historical novel about the life of Josephus, in which he tries to defend him from the charge of betraying the Jewish people.

### 28.5: Contemporary Drama about Herod

- (3488) FRIEDRICH HEBBEL: *Herodes und Mariamne: eine Tragödie in fünf Acten*. Wien 1850. Trans. into Hebrew by JACOB FICHMAN. Jerusalem 1949.
- (3489) CLEMENCE DANE (= WINIFRED ASHTON): *Herod and Mariamne*. New York 1938.
- (3490) AHARON ASHMAN: *Alexandra the Hasmonean* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1946 (Kenesset, vol. 10: YAAKOV COHEN, ed., Memorial vol. to Hayyim N. Bialik). Pp. 31–61.
- (3491) KAJ H. L. MUNK: *En Idealist*. Copenhagen 1920, 1928. Trans. into English by R. P. KEIGWIN: *Herod the King*. 1947. Rpt. in his: *Five Plays*. New York 1953. Pp. 23–86.
- (3492) ABEL J. HERZBERG: *Herodes de Geschiedenis van een tyran: een toneelstuk in zeven tonelen*. Amsterdam 1955.
- (3493) ADAH AMIKAL: *Herod the Edomite* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1968.

The most famous play on the Herod-Mariamne theme is that of Friedrich Hebbel, which appeared in 1850. FICHMAN (3488) has translated this play into Hebrew and has added, pp. 139–148, an essay on the play and on Hebbel.

DANE's (3489) drama is based on Hebbel's.

ASHMAN's (3490) drama is set in the period of Herod's illness after he had decided to kill Mariamne.

MUNK (3491), a Danish playwright whose fame for his treatment of 'strong men' in history is continually increasing, has written a play about Herod as a man who sacrificed everything for power, obsessed with the crazy notion of defying G-d.

HERZBERG (3492) has composed a play about Herod in Dutch.

AMIKAL (3493) has written a play in Hebrew about Herod.

### 28.6: Contemporary Poetry and Drama about Masada

- (3494) JUDAH ROSENTHAL: *On Masada and Its Heroes* (in Hebrew). In: *Hadoar* 47, no. 38, Sept. 20, 1968, pp. 693–695.
- (3495) ROBERT GORDIS: *On the Heroism of the Defenders of Masada* (in Hebrew). In: *Hadoar* 47, no. 40, Oct. 25, 1968, pp. 756–757.
- (3496) YIZHAK LAMDAN: *Masadah* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1927.
- (3497) AVI-SHMUEL: *News of Masada: A Play on the Fall of Masada* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv, Histadrut Hanoar Haoved, 1943.
- (3498) LOUIS I. NEWMAN: *Masada Shall Not Fall Again: A Dramatic Reading with Music*. New York, Congregation Rodeph Sholom, 1967 (produced at Temple Rodeph Sholom, New York City, March 3, 1967).
- (3498a) MARVIN DAVID LEVY: *Cantata Masada*. New York 1973.
- (3498b) BERNARD LEWIS: *History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented*. Princeton 1975.

ROSENTHAL (3494) asserts that the influence of Masada has been forgotten in Jewish literature; but, as GORDIS (3495) correctly notes, it was already the subject of a largely autobiographical epic poem in six cantos by LAMDAN (3496) in 1927, where Masada is a symbol of the land of Israel, the last hope of the declining Jewish communities of Eastern Europe, and the occasion for a reaffirmation of the fact that those who have sacrificed their lives for the new Masada have not done so in vain.

AVI-SHMUEL (3497) has penned a brief play for juveniles about Masada.

NEWMAN (3498) has written a brief version which has been set to music. I have not seen LEVY's (3498a) cantata.

LEWIS (3498b), pp. 8–9, discusses Yitzhak Lamdan's poem on Masada, which, he notes, is apocalyptic and full of dark portents of destruction and death. It is this poem which has the famous line "Masada shall not fall again", which has since become a watchword of the State of Israel.

## 28.7: Other Modern Drama

- (3499) JACOBUS JOHANNES MÜLLER: *Die Doper*; of, *Die Herodes-treurspel*. Pretoria 1937.
- (3500) NATHAN AGMON (BISTRITSKI): *Jerusalem and a Roman: Josephus Flavius: A Play in Eleven Scenes* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem (issued by Habimah Theatre) 1939. Portions printed in *Ha-'Olam*, vol. 27, no. 12, 12 January 1939, and in: *Ha-Arez*, no. 5920, 13 January 1939.
- (3501) NATHAN AGMON (BISTRITSKI): *A Jerusalem Night* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1953. Revised version of his play: *On This Night*. Jerusalem 1935.
- (3502) UNI MASADA: *Jerusalem: A Play in Four Acts* (in Hebrew). Trans. from English by BARUCH KRUPNICK. Tel-Aviv 1939.
- (3503) I. SEGAL: *I Shall Refill the Desolation: A Play in Two Acts* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1942. Pp. 69–72.
- (3504) CARL DE HAAS: *Berenice: A Tragedy in Five Acts* (in Hebrew). Trans. from the manuscript in German by EISIG SILBERSCHLAG. New York 1945.
- (3505) YA'AQOV CAHAN: *Jannaeus and Salome: A Play in Four Acts* (in Hebrew). In: *The Writings of Yā'āqov Cahan*, vol. 11. Tel-Aviv 1955. Pp. 5–92.
- (3506) MOSHE SHAMIR: *The War of the Sons of Light. A Play in Two Parts* (Prologue, four scenes, epilogue). Merḥavyah (published by Kamri Theatre) 1955.
- (3507) SHIN SHALOM (pseudonym of S. J. SCHAPIRA): *The Cave of Josephus* (in Hebrew). In his: *Ba-metah ha-gavohah: 9 Stories and a Drama*. Jerusalem 1956. Pp. 215–286. Revised version of his play by the same title in: *Gilyonoth* 2, 1934–35, pp. 406–432.
- (3508) SÁNDOR SCHEIBER, ed.: *Josephus Flavius és egy Katona József-drama 1814–böl*. In: *Évkönyv Magyar Israeliták Országos Képviselőte*. Budapest 1971–72. Pp. 236–240.

Most plays based on Josephus in our own day are in Hebrew, reflecting the tremendous renewal of interest in the State of Israel in Josephus as a national historian of the Jewish people.

MÜLLER (3499) has written a play, which I have been unable to read, in Afrikaans on Herod Antipas and John the Baptist.

AGMON (3500) has written a drama in Hebrew concerning the great Jewish revolt against Rome, centering on the personality of Josephus. He has also written another tragedy (3501) on the same theme.

MASADA (3502) has written a play, translated from English into Hebrew, which deals with the period of the destruction of the Second Temple.

SEGAL (3503) has written a very brief play in Hebrew about the destruction of the Second Temple.

DE HAAS (3504) has composed a tragedy on Berenice in which Josephus is one of the characters. The original German has never been published, but a Hebrew translation has appeared.

CAHAN (3505) has written a play in Hebrew on Alexander Jannaeus and Salome.

SHAMIR (3506) has composed a play in Hebrew set in the days of Alexander Jannaeus.

SHALOM (3507) has penned a Hebrew drama concerning Josephus' escape from Jotapata while his men perished.

SCHEIBER (3508) has commented on the use of Josephus by the Hungarian dramatist Ferenc Katona in one of his tragedies dealing with the destruction of Jerusalem.

## 28.8: Films

(3509) HENRY S. NOERDLINGER: *Moses and Egypt: The Documentation to the Modern Picture The Ten Commandments*. Los Angeles 1956. Trans. into German: *Moses und Ägypten. Die wissenschaftlichen Grundlagen des Films 'Die Zehn Gebote'*. Heidelberg 1957.

In view of the delicious mixture of sex and violence in the pages of Josephus, it is surprising that he has not been quarried to a greater degree by filmmakers.

NOERDLINGER (3509), in a popular work which discusses the documentation for the motion picture "The Ten Commandments", notes that Cecil B. DeMille, the producer, chose to incorporate several details found in Josephus, but NOERDLINGER cites them uncritically.

## 28.9: Contemporary Politics: the Masada Complex

(3510) ROBERT ALTER: *The Masada Complex*. In: *Commentary* 56, July, 1973, pp. 19–24.

(3511) MARIE SYRKIN: *The Paradox of Masada*. In: *Midstream* 19, October 1973, pp. 66–70.

(3511a) RAPHAEL ROTHSTEIN: *The Disturbing Myth*. In: *Ha-'Arez*, April 20, 1973.

(3511b) BENJAMIN KEDAR: *The Masada Complex*. In: *Ha-'Arez*, April 22, 1973.

(3511c) NORMAN B. MIRSKY: *From Yavneh to Masada*. Abstract in *Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Jerusalem, August 1973, p. B-109.

(3511d) BERNARD LEWIS: *History: Remembered, Recovered, Invented*. Princeton 1975.

(3511e) BAILA R. SHARGEL: *The Evolution of the Masada Myth*. In: *Judaism* 28, 1979, pp. 357–371.

In contemporary Israeli politics the term "Masada complex", referring to a kind of resignation to self-destruction when all else has failed, has played a considerable role. The analogy, as ALTER (3510) has stressed, between Israel's present embattled stance and Masada is usually drawn by those who are critical of Israel's foreign policy as inflexible; and such critics regard Israel as possessed of a death-wish. The former premier of Israel, Golda Meir, however, is quoted by SYRKIN (3511) as saying to an American newsman: "Yes, I have a Masada complex: the hazards we take avert rather than invite destruction". And the former



president of Israel, Zalman Shazar, is quoted as saying: "For us Masada means the will to live".

Thus, in the wake of the Yom Kippur War, Masada has once again become the symbol of a national agonizing, soul-searching debate.

ROTHSTEIN (3511a) and KEDAR (3511b) subject the Masada myth to the test of historical authenticity and credibility.

MIRSKY (3511c) shows how Josephus' account of Masada, woven together with the exploits of YIGAL YADIN, has come to serve as a sort of rescue-fantasy for post-World War II American Jews, thus accounting for their interest in and concern for Israeli life. We may comment, however, that it was not until YADIN began his excavations in 1963 that most American Jews became aware of Masada's significance, and that it was long before this time that they showed their intense commitment to Israel's survival.

LEWIS (3511d) compares the power ideological motivation, which he calls a new idolatry, behind the recovery of the lost chapters of Masada and of the founding of the Persian Empire. The commemoration of both, he notes, was made the foci of great national festivities. Both had been forgotten and were unknown among their own peoples and were recovered from outside sources. Both were recovered with the aid of archaeology.

SHARGEL (3511e) investigates the development of the Masada myth since the independence of the State of Israel. The story of Masada, she notes, has been important for modern Zionism, which held that the new Israel is a continuation of the Second Jewish Commonwealth, which fell at Masada, though, for practical purposes, as SHARGEL remarks, the Jews had lost their independence in 63 B.C.E., when Pompey entered Jerusalem. She comments, in particular, on the influence of LAM DAN, who settled in Palestine after the Russian pogroms following the Russian revolution, and who ultimately committed suicide. She suggests that YADIN helped foster the Masada myth because he realized that since the Sicarii were religious they could appeal to religious as well as to secular Israelis. She notes that by the mid-1970's Masada had become for many a symbol of what Israel did not want to become, and concludes that the interpretation of the Masada myth inevitably depends upon the circumstances in which the people of Israel find themselves.

## 29: Desiderata

### 29.0: Summary and Desiderata in the Study of Josephus: Bibliography

- (3512) MARCEL SIMON and ANDRÉ BENOIT: *Le judaïsme et le christianisme antique: d'Antiochus Épiphane à Constantin* (Nouvelle Clio, 10). Paris 1968.
- (3513) GERHARD DELLING: *Perspektiven der Erforschung des hellenistischen Judentums*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 45, 1974, pp. 133–176.
- (3514) OTTO MICHEL and OTTO BAERNFEIND, trans.: *Flavius Josephus. De bello judaico. Der jüdische Krieg. Griechisch und Deutsch*. Vol. 3 (with T. HIRSCH). München 1969.
- (3515) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Zur Josephus-Forschung* (Wege der Forschung, no. 84). Darmstadt 1973.

In the field of tools for bibliography, we may repeat the desirability of printed catalogues of the two largest catalogues of Jewish materials, namely the libraries of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York.

There have been several brief surveys of the state of Hellenistic Jewish scholarship. We may note, in particular, SIMON and BENOIT (3512), who present a conspectus of the problems and directions of research so far as Palestine and the Diaspora are concerned (pp. 199–206). They focus especially on the relationship of Israel and the Gentiles, including, above all, proselytism and the Zealots (pp. 207–216).

DELLING (3513) has little to say about desiderata for Josephus but does note the lack of handbooks in the history of Hellenistic Judaism generally (hardly a lacuna, we may remark, in view of the updating of SCHÜRER by VERMES and MILLAR), in the fields of Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha as well as Greco-Jewish writings, and in the beliefs and practices of Diaspora Jews in relation to their art.

There have been several brief surveys of the state of Josephan scholarship, notably by MICHEL and BAERNFEIND (3514), which is particularly stimulating, and by SCHALIT (3515), pp. vii–xviii.

We may remark that though the work done on Josephus has been disappointing in quality, it has certainly not lacked for quantity, especially in the last decade, because of the impetus of the continuing discoveries of the enigmatic Dead Sea Scrolls since 1947, archaeological finds (notably at Masada), and the renewed interest in Jewish history shown in the State of Israel since its founding in 1948. SCHRECKENBERG's bibliography, despite its many errors and lacunae, is

a most useful tool, and the present critical bibliography will hopefully be of assistance for the most recent period.

One desideratum may here be noted, namely a history of Josephan scholarship and the factors, not always scholarly, which have determined trends therein. Note should be taken of the role of Josephus in the history of Zionism.

### 29.1: Desiderata: the Tools for Scholarship in the Field of Hellenistic-Roman Jewish History

- (3516) WALLACE N. STEARNS: *Fragments from Graeco-Jewish Writers*. Chicago 1908.
- (3517) JEAN-BAPTISTE FREY: *Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*. Vol. 1 (Europe) Rome 1936; vol. 2 (Asie-Afrique) Rome 1952.
- (3517a) BARUCH LIFSHITZ, Prolegomenon to rpt. of: JEAN-BAPTISTE FREY, *Corpus of Jewish Inscriptions: Jewish Inscriptions from the Third Century B.C. to the Seventh Century A.D.*, Vol. 1: Europe. New York 1975. Pp. 21–104.
- (3518) DAVID M. LEWIS: *The Jewish Inscriptions of Egypt*. In: VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER, ALEXANDER FUKS, MENAHEM STERN, edd., *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Vol. 3. Cambridge, Mass. 1964. Pp. 138–166.
- (3519) HARRY J. LEON: *Appendix of Inscriptions*. In his: *The Jews of Ancient Rome*. Philadelphia 1960. Pp. 263–346.
- (3520) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*. 13 vols. New York 1953–68.
- (3521) MENAHEM STERN: *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. Vol. 1: From Herodotus to Plutarch. Jerusalem 1974. Vol. 2: From Tacitus to Simplicius. Jerusalem 1980.
- (3522) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Namenwörterbuch zu Flavius Josephus*. In: KARL H. RENGSTORF, ed., *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus, Supplement 1*. Leiden 1968.
- (3523) EDMUND GROAG and ARTHUR STEIN: *Prosopographia Imperii Romani Saec. I. II. III*. 2nd ed., Berlin 1933–58.
- (3524) NAOMI G. COHEN: *Jewish Names and Their Significance in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods in Asia Minor (in Hebrew)*. Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1969. 2 vols.
- (3524a) GERHARD DELLING: *Perspektiven der Erforschung des hellenistischen Judentums*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 45, 1974, pp. 133–176.

In general, the student in the field is in a good position to pursue scholarship so far as the basic collections of sources and other tools are concerned.

The student has available critical texts of Philo, Pseudo-Philo (by DANIEL J. HARRINGTON), and Josephus (though hopefully SCHRECKENBERG will undertake to re-edit him). We need a new collection, with critical texts, translations, and commentaries, of the Greco-Jewish writers to replace STEARNS (3516), which is utterly inadequate. As to the historians, NIKOLAUS WALTER has been working on an edition of Eupolemus for many years; and DENIS has edited the pseudepigraphic fragments.

For the inscriptions we have FREY (3517), which has many shortcomings and remains incomplete. LEWIS (3518) has considerably improved upon FREY for the Egyptian inscriptions and LEON (3519) for the inscriptions of Rome. For the Jewish art we have GOODENOUGH's (3520) magnificent collection, even if we may disagree with some of his conclusions.

LIFSHITZ (3517a) has extensive addenda and corrigenda in his Prolegomenon. He also comments critically on LEON (3519), especially on the names of the Jews.

For the Greek and Roman writers referring to the Jews, STERN (3521) has included very many passages missed by REINACH and has added an incisive commentary.

Though SCHALIT (3522) has given an index to the proper names in Josephus, and though FREY and TCHERIKOVER-FUKS-STERN have given us indices for the names in the inscriptions and papyri respectively, it would be most helpful if we had a prosopography comparable to GROAG-STEIN (3523) dealing with the Jews of the period. COHEN (3524) has made a beginning in her doctoral dissertation on Jewish names in literary and non-literary works during the Hellenistic and Roman periods in Asia Minor, but this should be extended to other portions of the world, and it should include the Talmudic corpus as well. Such a work will prove of value particularly when we discover, as archaeologists constantly do, for example at Sardis, names of people who may or may not be Jewish.

DELLING (3524a), in his review of research on Hellenistic Judaism, notes the lack of the following: 1) a comprehensive handbook on the history of Hellenistic Judaism; 2) a completion of the 'Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum', volume 2; 3) prosopography of the Hellenistic Jewish world; 4) a reinterpretation of Hellenistic Jewish art to supersede GOODENOUGH's 'Symbols'; 5) new research, with extensive indices, of key Greek and Latin words and topics.

## 29.2: Desiderata: the Text

(3525) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*. Leiden 1972.

SCHRECKENBERG (3525) has listed the authors who have cited Josephus; but a study remains to be made of the actual text of Josephus in each of these testimonies. This investigation would enable us to trace the beginning and development of the polarization of the texts of Josephus' main writings into two text families which apparently occurred in about the third century.

Once RENGSTORF's concordance to Josephus and BLATT's edition of the Latin Josephus (and, hopefully, additional studies of Josephus' grammar) have been completed, a new edition of the Greek text, last edited by NIESE (1885-95) and NABER (1888-96), will be a desideratum. Though, as I have discovered in preparing the text for my Loeb edition of *Antiquities* 18-20, the Latin version is generally not sound when it diverges from the Greek, it is several centuries older than any Greek manuscript that we possess, it often provides a hint of a better reading, particularly in proper names, and it is helpful in filling in lacunae. Neither NIESE nor NABER availed himself of the readings of the Latin version except on rare occasions; and SCHRECKENBERG, in his recent articles, has begun to explore its possible value. These studies, together with his

account of the transmission of Josephus, have laid the groundwork for a new edition of the Greek text.

### 29.3: Desiderata: the Latin, Slavonic, and Rumanian Versions; Josippon and the Arabic Version of Josippon

(3526) SISTER MONICA WAGNER: *Rufinus, the Translator: a Study of His Theory and His Practice as Illustrated in His Version of the Apologetica of St. Gregory Nazianzen* (Catholic University of America, Patristic Studies, 73, 1943).

(3526a) ALLISON P. HAYMAN, ed. and trans., *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew* (Corpus Christianorum Orientalium, 338–339). Louvain 1973.

Because the Latin version of the sixth century, as noted above, antedates by several centuries our Greek manuscripts, it is important for the reconstruction of the Greek text, particularly since the text of the 'Antiquities' is often in wretched shape. BLATT has published an edition of the first five books of the Antiquities; but, as we have indicated, the edition leaves so much to be desired that it will eventually have to be done over again. In particular, BLATT's stemma will have to be reconsidered, perhaps with the help of a computer, since the manuscripts are so numerous. BLATT has indicated to the present writer that his edition of Books 6–10 is completed and is awaiting publication. He apparently does not intend to go on. A critical edition of the remainder of the 'Antiquities' and of the 'War' is a definite desideratum. In this connection, as we have noted, the Constantinople recension of Josippon, which shows familiarity with the Latin Josephus, should prove of value in arriving at the Latin text.

Finally, when the critical edition of the Latin Josephus has been completed, it will be useful to compile a concordance of this version, with the aid of which a study should be made of the principles that governed this translation as compared with other translations of Rufinus, Cassiodorus, and similar writers of this period, as well as with the Vulgate and the Latin translation of Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', which was presumably done at about this time, as I have indicated in my Prolegomenon. Sister MONICA WAGNER (3526) has made a start, but she has not sufficiently explored the Latin Josephus.

As to the Slavonic version, we now have a good critical edition, but there are only two translations into modern languages, German (by BERENDTS and GRASS, 1924–27) and French (by PIERRE PASCAL, 1934–38). Translation into the other major languages should be undertaken because of the great interest of this work (and not merely because of the references to Jesus) and its influence. Most important we need a systematic study of the omissions of the Slavonic version.

The Rumanian version of the Slavonic Josephus, we are told, contains no new elements. We suspect, however, that further study of this version will aid in establishing the Slavonic text and occasionally in explaining it.

FLUSSER has finally completed his critical edition of Josippon, an extremely complex matter because of widely divergent texts. This we have eagerly awaited because until the nineteenth century Josephus was known to the Jewish world

through this version alone, almost without exception; and the non-Jewish world, which knew the original, utilized this version to a high degree also.

Now that we have a critical text of Josippon we need critical texts of the twelfth-century *Jerahmeel* and the thirteenth-century 'Sefer ha-Yashar', so that we may work out their exact relationship to each other and to Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', to the Greek text of Josephus, to Hegesippus, to the Slavonic Josephus, and to Immanuel ben Jacob Bonfils' Alexander Romance.

An important desideratum is a scientifically edited text of the Arabic version of Josippon, which was done in the tenth century. It should be of considerable value for arriving at the text of the original Josippon, whose text tradition is so complex.

HAYMAN (3526a) notes that several interesting agreements between Sergius the Stylite (in Syriac) and the Slavonic version merit further study.

#### 29.4: Desiderata: Accounts of Josephus as an Historian

- (3527) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (3528) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Herod, a Malevolent Maniac. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 54, 1963–64, pp. 1–27.
- (3529) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the 'Sefer ha-Kabbalah' with Special Emphasis on Josephus. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 59, 1968–69, pp. 171–214; 60, 1969–70, pp. 37–68, 375–406.
- (3530) TESSA RAJAK: *Josephus, Jewish History and the Greek World*. Diss., 2 vols. Oxford 1974.
- (3531) ARNOLD W. GOMME: *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. 5 vols. London 1945–81.
- (3532) FRANK W. WALBANK: *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. 2 vols. Oxford 1957–67.
- (3533) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Studies in Josephus*. London 1961.
- (3534) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.

Since the appearance of THACKERAY's (3527) work more than half a century ago, there has been no adequate systematic book-length study of Josephus, interpreting his personality and literary methods against the background of the Roman Empire and the Jewish society of his time. ZEITLIN (3528), p. 3, (3529), p. 178, promises to present a full analysis, in the fourth volume of his 'Rise and Fall of the Judean State', of Josephus' character and personality and of his sources. To some degree this has been fulfilled in an appendix in his posthumous third volume, pp. 385–417. RAJAK's (3530) doctoral thesis, which the present writer has not seen, deals with Josephus in the light of his Greek and Jewish background and will hopefully be published soon. Furthermore we lack a full-scale study of Josephus' philosophy of history.

Another major desideratum is a full-scale historical and archaeological commentary on his complete works comparable to GOMME's (3531) now complete commentary on Thucydides and WALBANK's (3532) on Polybius. To some

degree, the Loeb volumes edited by MARCUS, WIKGREN, and myself, with their somewhat more copious notes, supply this need; but these volumes are already antiquated because of the spectacular archaeological discoveries in recent years. SCHALIT had for many years prior to his death been working on a full-scale commentary on the second half of the 'Antiquities'.

There is need for an extended study of Josephus' relationship to his Greek predecessors, with a view to ascertaining to what degree his ideals and practice of historiography, as well as his philosophy of history, are indebted to classical Greek historians, notably Herodotus and especially Thucydides, and to Hellenistic writers, particularly Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. SHUTT's (3533) work is far from exhaustive and almost exclusively concerned with stylistic matters and vocabulary and is hardly systematic; he does not consider, for example, the influence of Dionysius' rhetorical and critical treatises on Josephus. When Rengstorff's concordance to Josephus has been completed, we shall be in a better position to do lexicographical, grammatical, and stylistic studies comparing Josephus and Dionysius. Moreover, it would be useful and enlightening to study comparable incidents in these writers, e.g. the death of Moses compared with Dionysius' account of the death of Romulus, a topic merely touched upon by THACKERAY (3527), pp. 56-57.

There is also need of a systematic comparison of Josephus with other historians, notably Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius, where they parallel Josephus, as well as with Babylonian and Parthian materials. This should prove valuable both in establishing the relationship of these historians to Josephus and also in helping to determine the sources, the historiographical method, and reliability of Josephus. The most notable passage where Josephus may be compared with Suetonius and Dio is in the first three-quarters of Book 19 of the 'Antiquities'; the passages where he may be compared with Tacitus are scattered in the latter books of the 'Antiquities' and in the 'War'.

Moreover, a monograph systematically evaluating Josephus in his handling of Parthian affairs, as compared with Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius, has not appeared since TÄUBLER's in 1904. A study taking into account the new epigraphical and numismatic evidence is a desideratum.

Almost no work has been done on Josephus' Latin sources. It is likely that he did know Latin and that he was indebted in stylistic, and perhaps in rhetorical matters, to Sallust and Cicero.

LAQUEUR based his theory of a personal development in Josephus on a thorough comparison of 'Antiquities', Book 14, and War, Book 1, which deal with the Hasmonean downfall and the rise of Herod, and did not concern himself with the major part of Josephus' Hasmonean and Herodian history. SCHALIT in his work on Herod has extended this to the account of Herod; but a thorough systematic comparison of the 'Antiquities' and the 'War' as to Herod's successors remains to be made.

As to Josephus' handling of the great revolution against Rome, COHEN (3534) has called attention to the fact that since the war also embraced economic strife between upper and lower classes, it would be useful to study the degree to

which the upper classes, and not merely the lower classes, suffered economically at the hands of the procurators.

### 29.5: Desiderata: Josephus and the Bible

- (3535) BO JOHNSON: Die Armenische Bibelübersetzung als hexaplarischer Zeuge im 1. Samuelbuch. Lund 1968.
- (3536) HAIM SCHWARZBAUM: Studies in Jewish and World Folklore. Berlin 1968.
- (3536a) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus. Leiden 1977.
- (3536b) SEBASTIAN P. BROCK: The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel. Diss., D.Phil., Oxford 1966.

A systematic examination of Josephus' Biblical text in relation to the Hebrew, the Samaritan, the Septuagint, Aquila, Theodotion, Symmachus, Lucian and proto-Lucian, the Itala, the Vulgate, the Armenian, the Targumim, the Peshitta, Philo, and Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' would be most desirable. Such a study would be especially valuable in the light of the discovery of the Targum Neofiti and of the advances in general in Targumic studies, since it appears clear that Josephus bears a very definite relationship to the Targumim, as well as of the Biblical texts found in the Dead Sea caves, of BARTHÉLEMY'S theory of Proto-Theodotion and Proto-Aquila, of CROSS' theory of local texts, and of my own and HARRINGTON'S studies of Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', which often bears a strikingly close relationship to Josephus' text. Such a study will help to establish Josephus' understanding of the theory and practice of translation.

In particular, since, as has been noted by JOHNSON (3535), the *Vorlage* of the Second Armenian translation was close to the proto-Lucianic text, it would be instructive to compare the readings of this translation with other proto-Lucianic texts, including Josephus and Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities'.

Another comparative study should be made of Josephus' historiographical method as seen in his paraphrase of the Bible in the first half of the 'Antiquities'. I have examined several episodes, but many remain to be considered and compared with the treatments in the Hebrew text, the Septuagint and other versions, the Targumim, the Dead Sea Scrolls, Philo, other Hellenistic-Jewish writers (for several of whom critical texts and thorough commentaries are desiderata), Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities', the Apocrypha, the Pseudepigrapha, the Church Fathers, and rabbinic literature. In particular, a thorough comparison with Philo in terms of their methods of Biblical exegesis, rhetoric, historiography, philosophy of history, and ideologies remains a desideratum. The comparison with Pseudo-Philo, which has been almost untouched, should prove especially fruitful, since, as we have noted above, there are a number of passages unique to these writers. There are enough episodes in Josephus to be thus considered for at least twenty doctoral theses, without exaggeration. In addition, we need a systematic comparison of I Maccabees and the 'Antiquities' similar to that done by PELLETIER for 'Aristeas'.



Embedded in Josephus' material is a great deal of folklore; and in this connection it may be noted that SCHWARZBAUM (3536), p. 46, states that a thorough folkloristic comparative study of Josephus' narrative material is one of the vital tasks of folklore scholarship.

SCHRECKENBERG (3536a), pp. 49–50, notes that the 'Chronicle of Moses' in Hebrew, with its Midrashic additions to the life of Moses, bears a relationship to the 'Antiquities', and that the nature of this relationship requires investigation.

BROCK (3536b), pp. 207–221, notes that no thorough investigation of the Biblical text behind the first four books of the 'Antiquities' covering the material of the Torah has yet been carried out; and this helps to explain the widely divergent views held by various scholars, such as BLOCH (3536c) and THACKERAY (3536d). [See *infra*, p. 975.]

## 29.6: Desiderata: Spurious Works

(3537) STANISLAW SKIMINA: *État actuel des études sur le rythme de la prose grecque*. Cracovie 1937.

(3538) WILLIAM C. WAKE: Sentence-Length Distributions of Greek Authors. In: *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A*, 120, 1957, pp. 331–346.

SKIMINA'S (3537) study of prose rhythms confirms that IV Maccabees differs markedly from the other works ascribed to Josephus; but a systematic study of the vocabulary, grammar, and style remains a desideratum.

We may here suggest that WAKE'S (3538) study of patterns of sentence-length which he used to determine the authorship of the *Corpus Hippocraticum*, of Plato's 'Seventh Letter', and of the three ethical works ascribed to Aristotle may be worth applying to the allegedly spurious works of Josephus. Of course, we may caution that there is some ambiguity in antiquity as to where sentences end.

## 29.7: Desiderata: Josephus and Halakhah

(3539) HARRY O. H. LEVINE: *Halakah in Josephus*. Diss., Dropsie College, Philadelphia 1935.

LEVINE (3539) has written a dissertation on the subject of Halakhah in Josephus, but all attempts by the present writer to obtain it have proven fruitless. Many individual areas of the subject remain to be investigated. In addition, we need a systematic comparison of the Halakhah in the 'Antiquities' and 'Against Apion' and the scattered references in the 'Life' and the 'War'. Finally, a systematic comparison of Josephus with Philo and the various strata in the Talmud is a desideratum.

### 29.8: Desiderata: Josephus' Language, Style, and Literary Techniques

- (3540) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (3541) NAOMI G. COHEN: *Jewish Names and Their Significance in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods in Asia Minor* (in Hebrew). Diss., 2 vols., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1969.

Once the RENGSTORF concordance has been completed it will be highly desirable to compile a study of Josephus' word-usage and style, in an attempt to settle once and for all the differences in vocabulary and style between Josephus and his so-called assistants. In addition, we are in great need of a grammar to Josephus: this would be of crucial aid to the next editor of Josephus' text. We may thereafter systematically seek to detect evidence of revisions and second editions and to determine the relationship of the seventh book of the 'War' to the first six, among other questions.

COHEN (3540) has dealt with the problem of Josephus' method of paraphrasing himself and has noted that it would be highly desirable to have an overall study of the problem of self-repetition in antiquity, including such writers as Xenophon, Plutarch, and Tertullian.

We also need a study of the methods of Josephus, his predecessors, and successors in introducing and re-introducing characters and places, since this is of importance for source-criticism.

Josephus' Atticizing should be studied with reference to such rhetoricians as Theon and Hermogenes. Their methods of introducing citations and allusions should shed light on those of Josephus.

Inasmuch as Josephus' first language was Aramaic and since he first composed the 'War' in that language, we should expect more Aramaisms than have been discovered thus far in his works, even if he did have assistants for the sake of the Greek in the 'War', at any rate. Just as a translation of the Gospels into Aramaic, Jesus' first language, has proven suggestive, so a translation into Aramaic of the 'War' and of the Biblical portion of the 'Antiquities' and of the episodes dealing with Babylonian and Adiabenean Jews might prove fruitful. COHEN (3541), Chapter A, no. 19, p. 85, has noted, for example, a parallel between the Syriac Peshitta (very similar to Aramaic) and Josephus with respect to the name Rubel for Reuben.

### 29.9: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Ancient, Medieval, and Renaissance Literature

- (3542) EVA M. SANFORD: *Propaganda and Censorship in the Transmission of Josephus*. In: *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 66, 1935, pp. 127–145.
- (3543) FRANK GAVIN: *Aphraates and the Jews*. Toronto 1923.
- (3544) MAX MANITIUS: *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. 3 vols. München 1911–31.

(3544a) ROBERT W. THOMSON: *The Maccabees in Early Armenian Historiography*. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 26, 1975, pp. 329–341.

Except for one very brief and totally inadequate survey by SANFORD (3542) and the few scattered articles noted above, the subject of Josephus' influence remains to be traced. Such an investigation should seek to correlate the interest in Josephus generally, as well as in specific aspects of Josephus, with the given period. Emphasis should be placed on the following areas.

1. Samaritan, especially historical, literature, including the influence of Josippon.

2. Pagan writers (Greek and Latin), including Tacitus, Dio Cassius, and Porphyry.

3. Greek Church Fathers, including Origen, Eusebius (the one Father on whom considerable work has been done), Pseudo-Eustathius, John Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Isidore of Pelusium.

4. Latin Church Fathers, including Tertullian, Lactantius, Ambrose, Jerome (who deserves a full-scale study), Augustine, and Cassiodorus, and, in particular, the influence of Josephus' exposition of Scripture on the Fathers.

5. Syriac literature, notably Ephraem Syrus, in his fourth-century exposition of the Jewish Scriptures and in his world chronicle from the creation to the birth of Jesus, and Aphraates, whose eschatology, says GAVIN (3543), p. 53, is closer to Josephus and to Philo than to the rabbis. We may note that the Syriac version of the 'War', Book 6, made before the sixth century, was actually included in the sacred canon of the Syriac Church.

6. Armenian, especially historical, literature and Biblical commentaries.

7. Medieval Latin literature, through the Latin versions of Rufinus and Hegesippus. MANITIUS (3544) has brief scattered references to Josephus' influence on Isidore of Seville, Adamnan, Bede, Alchrine, Notker, Angelomus, Albarus of Cordova, Lupus, Remigius, Frechulph, Widukind, Odo of Cluny, Adalger, Lambert of Deutz, Marianus Scotus, Gerhoh of Reichersburg, Peter Comestor, Peter Cantor, Lambert of St. Omer, Peter of Blois, Frutolf, Otto of Freising, Rahewin, Gotfrid of Viterbo, Baudri of Bourgeuil, Wilhelm of Tyre, Galfred of Monmouth, Oderic, Radulf de Diceto, Walter of Chatillon, and Acardus of Arroasia. To this we may add the use of Josephus in contemporary controversies, e.g., by Hincmar of Rheims in his attack on Godescalc. Gerhoh, we may note, used Josephus in his pamphlet on the investiture controversy, and Radulf de Diceto employed him in his justification of the royal family of England. Moreover, a thorough study of the role of Josephus' account of Alexander the Great in the development of the Alexander romance will also repay investigation.

It will be useful to ask why Josephus was more popular in certain regions of Europe at certain times than at others; e.g., in the twelfth century he seems to have been particularly popular in northeastern France and in the Rhineland. The revival of concern with Biblical revelation and the intensification of Christian-Jewish polemics may be factors here. Josephus' influence on the Crusades likewise deserves systematic study.

As to Hegešippus, its popularity, which deserves to be traced, is shown not only by the numerous manuscripts and quotations in the Middle Ages but also by metrical and rhymed versions. Its use in efforts to convert Jews to Christianity should also be explored.

8. Byzantine Greek writers, including Syncellus, Photius, and Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos.

We also need an expert in Byzantine literature to collect all the false references to Josephus in medieval Greek literature and to ascertain their source. EISLER began this study, but his theories of lost editions mark him as erratic.

9. Karaitic, especially historical literature and Biblical commentaries, including the influence of Josippon.

10. Renaissance Hebrew literature, notably the fifteenth-century Hebrew commentator, Isaac Abrabanel, who apparently knew Josephus directly and not merely Josippon.

It would be valuable to trace the influence of the themes of the Temple and of Jerusalem generally (where the influence of Josephus' descriptions is manifest) on literature generally. It would also be interesting to investigate the use made of the 'Testimonium Flavianum' in Christian-Jewish polemics and disputations. For example, the fifteenth-century Hayim Ibn Musa of Bejar, Spain, in his 'Magen va-Romah' ('Shield and Spear'), refuses to accept Christian proofs from the New Testament or Josephus. In the seventeenth century the Italian Jew Leon de Modena, in his 'Magen be-Herev' ('Shield and Sword'), analyzes the elements of the New Testament and relates them to the facts given by Josephus.

THOMSON (3544a) notes that the Armenian assimilation of material from Josephus and Eusebius is not fully charted.

## 29.10: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Modern Literature

(3545) NICOLAUS CAUSSIN: *La Cour Sainte*. Paris 1624, Roŕen 1655. Trans. into English by THOMAS HAWKINS et al.: *The Holy Court*. London 1626.

(3546) W. MALEJ: *Essay on Josephus in Poland* (in Polish). In: ZYGMUNT KUBIAK and JAN RADOZYCKI, trans., Jozef Flawiusz. *Dawne dzieje Izraela*. *Antiquitates Judaicae*. Poznan 1962.

Individual and comparative studies deserve to be undertaken on the influence of Josephus on the following:

1. Czech literature. The fact that before 1600 no less than three different translations of works of Josephus into Czech appeared (1553, 1591, 1592) indicates his popularity. An examination of Czech literature should prove useful; and one may expect, in particular, that Josephus played a role in the writings of the Reformation.

2. Dutch literature. Five translations of Josephus appeared in Dutch by 1665 (1482, 1553, 1593, 1626, 1665).

3. English literature. By 1700 six translations of Josephus into English had appeared (1555, 1602, 1661, 1676, 1692, 1700). In addition, Josippon was especially popular in English translation, and in the seventeenth century was

widely used in polemics against Jews. A study of Josephus' influence on English literature, including Milton, whose 'Samson Agonistes' is definitely indebted to Josephus, will prove especially rewarding. Amazingly little has been written on the subject of this influence, which has been vast and pervasive in almost every period. In particular, it would be valuable to correlate the attitude toward Josephus with major events in the history of England. The influence of WHISTON's eighteenth-century translation, by far the most popular of all versions of Josephus into a modern tongue, deserves a study in itself. WHISTON, it will be recalled, made of Josephus a Christian bishop of Jerusalem.

4. American literature. In the United States WHISTON's translation was reprinted at least 53 times between 1794 and 1900. Its influence was clearly very great.

5. French literature. By 1700 more than twice as many translations into French of Josephus had appeared (1492, 1516, 1530, 1534, 1553, 1558, 1569, 1572, 1578, 1595, 1597, 1667, 1696) as into any other modern language. The influence on such writers as Bayle and Voltaire is very great, yet has hardly been explored. In addition, we should consider the indirect influence of Josephus through such works as CAUSSIN's (3545) moralized history, which was so much used by the pious in France and (through its English version) in England.

6. German literature. Three translations into German (1531, 1569 [2]) had appeared by 1700. The revival of interest brought about by the Reformation deserves to be traced. Several of the reformers, notably CASPAR HEDION and CONRAD LAUTENBACH in the sixteenth century, translated Josephus into the vernacular. The influence of the Latin Josephus and of these German translations deserves study.

7. Hungarian literature. A metrical translation of the 'War' into Hungarian had already appeared in 1582. Its influence and that of the Latin Josephus on Hungarian literature must have been considerable.

8. Italian literature. Six translations of Josephus into Italian appeared (1493, 1532, 1544, 1581, 1620, 1653) before 1700.

9. Polish literature. The influence of Josephus on Polish literature comes from the translation into Polish of the Slavonic Josephus as well as through the Latin Josephus. MALAJ (3546) has traced this influence briefly.

10. Spanish literature. The one literature the influence of Josephus upon which has been systematically studied is Spanish. LIDA DE MALKIEL's full-length study deserves to be completed and to be published in its entirety.

## 29.11: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Modern Historiography

(3547) NAHUM GLATZER: Josephus Flavius in Klausner's Historiography (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron* 39, 1958-59, pp. 101-105.

The treatment of Josephus in modern historiography, in such historians as HEINRICH GRAETZ, ISAAC HALEVY, and JOSEPH KLAUSNER, deserves study. A start has been made in GLATZER's (3547) article. An interesting study might also

be made on the background of modern scholars, such as SCHÜRER, SCHLATTER, HÖLSCHER, LAQUEUR, THACKERAY, SCHALIT, and ZEITLIN, and their views on Josephus. Finally, a study should be made of the views of Josephus held by leaders in the history of modern Zionism.

## 29.12: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Art and Music

- (3547a) CARL-OTTO NORDSTRÖM: *The Duke of Alba's Castilian Bible: A Study of the Rabbinical Features of the Miniatures* (Uppsala Studies in the History of Art, n. S. 5). Uppsala 1967.

NORDSTRÖM (3547a) presents a thesis that there existed in antiquity illustrated Jewish manuscripts and that Jewish models served as a source of inspiration for miniatures in manuscripts such as that of the fifteenth-century translation of the Bible into Castilian by Rabbi Moses Arragel. We may suggest that a systematic study of existing illustrations in Jewish manuscripts to determine the extent to which they are dependent upon Josephus' interpretation of the Bible remains a desideratum.

Our brief survey of Josephus' influence on the arts presents a mere glimpse of the subject. A study of miniatures in manuscripts of Josephus should be undertaken, with a consideration of their possible influence on the illustrations of Passover Haggadahs. In addition, a study of the influence of Josephus on the depiction of the Temple and of the Temple's implements in illuminated manuscripts should prove rewarding. It would also be interesting to trace the influence of Josephus on Renaissance masters who sought to evoke the glory of Rome. In particular, the influence of Josephus on such painters as the fourteenth-century Altichiero and Avarizi and the fifteenth-century Mantegna should be traced. Finally, it would be useful to trace systematically the changes in the depiction of Josephus himself in sculpture and in painting, especially in manuscripts of his works.

A number of composers were inspired by themes (including especially the theme of Jerusalem) in Josephus: Galuppi, Gluck, Hasse, Jommelli, Leo, Mozart, Sarti, and Scarlatti. The subject has hardly been touched.

## 29.13: Desiderata: the Influence of the Slavonic Version of Josippon, and of the Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon

- (3548) SALO W. BARON: *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Vol. 6. New York 1958.  
 (3549) AARON Z. AEŠCOLY: *A Lost Chapter of the Hebrew Chronicle* (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 5, 1934, pp. 341–349.  
 (3550) AARON Z. AEŠCOLY: *Die äthiopische Übersetzung eines Kapitels aus einer verlorenen hebräischen Chronik*. In: *Orientalia* 6, 1937, pp. 101–115.

In general, the Slavonic version was the nearest approach to a classical author read in Old Russian and had some influence on secular Russian literature. The fact that it was translated into Serbian, Polish, and Rumanian

suggests its popularity and its influence on these literatures as well. It, moreover, helped to spread Unitarianism.

The influence on medieval and Renaissance Hebrew commentaries, generally through Josippon, who was almost the only systematic source among Jews until the nineteenth century for the history of the fall of the Second Temple, includes such names as Rashi (who trusted it without question), the Tosafists, Jerahmeel, 'Sefer ha-Yashar', and Abrabanel. (SAMUEL BEN MOSES SHULLAM did a very free translation of Josephus' 'Against Apion', which was published in 1566 in Constantinople; it would be interesting to trace the influence of this work). The influence of Josippon is by no means restricted to Jewish writers, since the idea evolved among some Christian scholars during the Renaissance and the Reformation that Josippon was more worthy of study than Josephus since it was the basic work intended for Jews, while Josephus was intended merely for Gentiles. Furthermore, as BARON (3548), p. 419, has well suggested, the Messianic and apologetic implications of Josippon's historical outlook for the later history of Judaism merit further study.

The Arabic version, made from Josippon, had great influence, which has never been systematically traced, on Moslem historians, especially the great fourteenth-century Ibn Khaldun, as well as on Christians in Egypt.

The Ethiopic version, made from the Arabic, became a semi-canonical work of the Monophysite Church, and its impact must have been great, though this influence has been noted only by AEŠCOLY (3549)(3550) and never systematically studied.





## Addenda

### 1.1: The Quantity and Languages of Josephan Scholarship

(1b) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: *Flavius Josephus*. Heidelberg 1978.

VAN UNNIK (1b) laments that Josephus is a neglected author, noting that SCHRECKENBERG has 138 pages of bibliography for the period before 1900 and 103 for the period from 1900 to 1945 (i.e. 1944), but only 71 for 1945–1970. We may comment, however, that actually SCHRECKENBERG has 68 pages for 1945–1965, since for 1966–1968, as he himself realized, his coverage is sporadic. I myself (1a) have 61 typewritten pages of supplementary entries for 1900–1944 and 70 such pages for 1945–1965. VAN UNNIK is correct, however, in asserting that modern researchers have treated the same themes over and over again and that Josephus still has much to reveal to the scholar.

### 2.12: Brief Selective Bibliographies of Hellenistic Judaism

(38c) ANDRÉ PAUL: *Bulletin de littérature intertestamentaire. Du Judaïsme ancien au Christianisme primitif*. In: *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 68, 1980, pp. 463–480, 519–552.

PAUL (38c) includes six books on Hellenistic Judaism.

### 2.15: Specialized Bibliographies: Philo

(48c) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1976–1977*. In: *Studia Philonica* 5, 1978, pp. 113–120.

(48d) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1978*. In: *Studia Philonica* 6, 1979–1980, pp. 197–200.

HILGERT (48c) (48d) brings his bibliography up through 1978.

### 2.16: Specialized Bibliographies: the Essenes, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Slavonic Josephus

(59f) HOWARD L. GOODHART and ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *A General Bibliography of Philo Judaeus*. In: ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus. Practice and Theory*. New Haven 1938. Pp. 282–289.

GOODHART and GOODENOUGH (59f) have a listing of items, starting from the sixteenth century, pertaining to the Essenes and the Therapeutae. Those pertaining to the Essenes are actually concerned mainly with Josephus' description of them.

### 3.0: Editions of the Greek Text

(76b) FRIEDRICH REHKOPF, ed.: Josephus. Werke (selections). (Aschendorffs Sammlung lateinischer und griechischer klassiker Lesehefte). Münster 1968.

REHKOPF (76b) contains selections from the Greek text with very brief explanatory notes.

### 3.3: Textual criticism

Supra, p. 27 ad 102a: SÁENZ has a critical note on Antiquities 14. 118, where he reads *κεκινημένος*, although it is a *lectio facillior*, rather than *νενηκημένος*, because it is a *terminus technicus* of the Greek tradition on mantic inspiration.

(102b) REINHOLD MERKELBACH: Des Josephus Prophezeiung für Vespasian. In: Rheinisches Museum 122, 1979, p. 361.

MERKELBACH (102b) suggests emending War 3. 401 so as to eliminate the lacuna. Instead of τί γάρ; . . . οἱ μετὰ Νέρωνα μέχρι σοῦ διάδοχοι μενοῦσι he reads ἔτι γάρ; οἱ μετὰ Νέρωνα μέχρις οὗ διάδοχοι μενοῦσι. The meaning would be: "Do you suppose that this is still possible? [i. e., is Nero still alive?] How long will the successors of Nero remain?" We may comment that the fact that the transition in thought to the successors of Nero is made by MERKELBACH without so much as a particle is harsh.

MERKELBACH also suggests emending τριετίᾳ (War 2. 161) to τριμηνίᾳ; but this change, though it accords with the context (i. e., the Essenes give their wives three months of probation and marry them only after they have by three periods of purification shown proof of fecundity), is transcriptionally improbable.

### 4.1: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into French

Supra, p. 32 ad 133a: SAVINEL has a highly readable and generally accurate translation with very brief notes.

#### 4.6: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Other Languages: Arabic, Czech, Dutch, etc.

- (170h) GOHEI HATA, trans.: Flavius Josephus: *Antiquitates Judaicae*, Books 16–17 (in Japanese). Tokyo 1980.  
 (170i) GOHEI HATA, trans.: Flavius Josephus: *Antiquitates Judaicae*, Books 18–19 (in Japanese). Tokyo 1980.  
 (170j) GOHEI HATA, trans.: Flavius Josephus: *Antiquitates Judaicae*, Book 20 (in Japanese). Tokyo 1981 (with maps and index to Books 12–20).

HATA (170h) (170i) (170j) has brought his translation of the ‘Antiquities’ through Book 20.

#### 5.4: The Content of Hegesippus and Its Relation to Josippon

- (186b) ALBERT A. BELL, JR.: Classical and Christian Traditions in the Work of Pseudo-Hegesippus. In: *Indiana Social Studies Quarterly* 33, 1980, pp. 60–64.

BELL (186b) summarizes the aim of Pseudo-Hegesippus and the state of scholarship on his work. He notes that the frequent use of the word *excidium*, referring particularly to the fall of Jerusalem, the Temple, and the Jews, is the key to the author’s purpose. The work, he remarks, like Augustine’s ‘City of G-d’, has a theological goal, but Pseudo-Hegesippus differs from Augustine in conforming totally to classical canons in his prologue, in his blending of source materials into his own style, and in his speeches. In short, Pseudo-Hegesippus is a major transitional figure between the classical and Christian traditions.

#### 7.1: The Text of Josippon

- (287e) CLEMENS THOMA: Ein mittelalterliches hebräisches Werk über die Geschichte des Judentums im Zeitalter des 2. Tempels. In: *Freiburger Rundbrief* 30, 1978, pp. 211–212.

THOMA (287e) is very appreciative of FLUSSER’s (287c) edition, noting, in particular, the interpolations on John the Baptist and Jesus which appear in many manuscripts of Josippon and which were later omitted by Christian censors.

#### 7.6: The Content and Outlook of Josippon

- (354f) MARINA PUCCI: The Tendentiousness of Josephus’ Historical Writing. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 10–11.

PUCCI (354f) cites, as an example of Josephus’ tendentiousness, the fact that he omits the mention found in Josippon (chapter 28) of the alliance between Hyrcanus I and the Parthian king Phraates II against the Seleucid king Antiochus

Sidetes, as well as the connection between Aristobulus II and Mithradates, king of Pontus. In both cases Josephus, as a lackey of Rome, suppressed the facts because the Jews were negotiating with enemies of the Romans. We may, however, comment that while no one will deny that Josephus is at times tendentious, Josippon is not only late but, in his own way, no less tendentious, and is hardly a reliable guide for judging the objectivity of Josephus.

## 8.0: Josephus' Life: General

- (371f) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus Flavius: A Biographical Essay*. In his: *The Rise and Fall of the Judean State*. Vol. 3: 66 C.E.–120 C.E. Philadelphia 1978. Pp. 385–417.
- (371g) LEA ROTH-GARSON: *The Contribution of Josephus Flavius to the Study of the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. In: *A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 31–33.

ZEITLIN (371f) presents a general survey of Josephus' life and works.

ROTH-GARSON (371g) notes that Josephus' personal interest in the Diaspora was based upon the fact that he had lived for many years in Rome, had visited Alexandria, and was connected by marriage to an Alexandrian and a Cretan woman. To this we may add that his proficiency in Greek must have created an additional tie, particularly with Alexandrian Judaism.

## 8.2: Josephus' Family, Education, and Early Life

- (385f) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *History of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). Vol. 5. Jerusalem 1949.

KLAUSNER (385f), pp. 167–168, argues that Josephus' trip to Rome actually increased his enthusiasm for the cause of the revolutionaries inasmuch as he must have been impressed with Rome's decadence and hence saw that it was only a matter of time before Rome would fall. His opposition to the revolutionaries was not in fighting Rome but only in taking the initiative when they did. We may respond that there is no hint in Josephus himself that he was thus impressed with Rome's degeneration (unless we regard the cryptic passage in *Antiquities* 10. 210 as such a clue); and, indeed, at every opportunity he states his conviction that Rome's ascendancy is part of a Divine plan. We may suggest that KLAUSNER may have been influenced in his view by his own ultra-nationalism.

## 8.3: Josephus' Appointment as Military General in Galilee

- (398c) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus Flavius: A Biographical Essay*. In his: *The Rise and Fall of the Judean State*. Vol. 3: 66 C.E.–120 C.E. Philadelphia 1978. Pp. 385–417.

- (398d) SEAN FREYNE: *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B. C. E. to 135 C. E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Wilmington, Delaware and Notre Dame, Indiana 1980.

ZEITLIN (398c) argues that whereas officially Josephus was sent to Galilee as a commander to weld the revolutionaries into an efficient fighting force, his secret orders were the exact opposite, namely, to neutralize the Galilaeans.

FREYNE (398d), pp. 208–255, disagrees with the preponderant scholarly opinion, which accepts Josephus' statement in his 'Life' that he attempted to contain the revolutionary situation in Palestine while at the same time placating the extreme radicals under the guise of preparing for war. In agreement with COHEN (398), he regards this as an oversimplification, even if we were to accept the statement that a general council representing the Jews supposedly took control of the war effort and so gave it a specious legitimacy (War 2.562–568). He notes that the fact that a Jerusalemite was given command of Galilee was the first cause of friction, since it alienated local leadership.

#### 8.4: Josephus' Conduct as Military General in Galilee

- (403a) SEAN FREYNE: *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B.C. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism*. Wilmington, Delaware and Notre Dame, Indiana 1980.
- (403b) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian*. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.

FREYNE (403a), pp. 77–97, 208–255, argues that Josephus' provisioning of the army, the building of fortifications, and his attempts to make Sepphoris give up its pro-Roman stance (Life 104, 111, 378–380, 394–396) all are clear indications that Josephus actively pursued the war with Rome. FREYNE, however, disagrees with COHEN's (403b) statement that the basis of Galilaean support for Josephus was that Josephus was inspired by the ideals of the Zealots in Jerusalem. More likely, he says, Josephus was apologetically concerned with his own personal position than with apocalyptic-style revelation. He argues that Galilee remained primarily Jewish and rural, and that the Galilaean peasants were hardly affected by Hellenistic and Roman cultural influences, Jewish revolutionary movements, or, for that matter, primitive Christianity, and that it is, therefore, unlikely that Galilee caused the Romans any undue anxiety during this period. As to Josephus' army, FREYNE concludes that the accounts of the 'War' and of the 'Life' are in basic agreement, and that there is consequently some substance to his reports, though on a substantially diluted scale. In particular, Josephus' figures are exaggerated. Josephus, he concludes, was not a general of outstanding bravery, foresight, and moderation, but neither was he a pro-Roman peacemaker.

#### 8.5: Josephus' Surrender at Jotapata

- (425e) MORDECAI GIḤON: *The Plans of Josephus* (in Hebrew). In: *Et-mol* 2, May 1977, pp. 14–16.

- (425f) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus Flavius: A Biographical Essay*. In his: *The Rise and Fall of the Judaean State*. Vol. 3: 66 C.E. – 120 C.E. Philadelphia 1978. Pp. 385–417.
- (425g) ELIAS CANETTI: *Masse und Macht*. Hamburg 1960. Trans. into English by CAROL STEWART: *Crowds and Power*. New York 1962.

GIḤON (425e) presents a very brief popular account of the defense of Jotapata against the Romans.

ZEITLIN (425f) argues that Josephus acted as he did because he believed that he would save his people. In this, he concludes, Josephus was no different from Joḥanan ben Zakkai.

CANETTI (425g), pp. 234–242, in a popular work, analyzes the psychology of Josephus in his dealings with his men before their suicide at Jotapata, as well as his psychology in prophesying that Vespasian would become emperor. He concludes that Josephus believed in himself more strongly than anything else because he had survived his own people in the cave at Jotapata.

## 8.6: Josephus' Prophecy to Vespasian

Supra, p. 94 ad 427–429:

BAER (427) argues unconvincingly that the story of Joḥanan's escape was written in the fifth century and was influenced by the accounts of the Christian historians Sulpicius Severus and Orosius, who, in turn, depended upon Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius. We may comment, however, that the fact that there are several accounts of the incident in the Talmudic corpus and that all differ significantly from Sulpicius, Orosius, Josephus, Tacitus, and Suetonius argues against BAER's thesis. Moreover, it is very unlikely that the rabbis derived material from Orosius since, with very few exceptions, notably Jerome, the Church deliberately avoided contact with the rabbis during this period and vice versa. BAER hypothesizes that the rabbinic author portrayed Joḥanan as requesting Yavneh in order to save face for Joḥanan in view of his inability to preserve the Temple. We may argue in reply that an astute leader would realize that a request for Jerusalem was unrealistic, given the fact that Vespasian was Rome's representative, not its leader, as, in fact, is clear in the account in 'Lamentations Rabbah'.

SCHALIT (429), after asking whether the prophecy of Josephus is an invention of the writer to give a theatrical effect to the reader, answers that such a view overlooks the fact that the prophecy appears in the 'War', which was presented to Vespasian and Titus for review. He concludes that Josephus and Joḥanan, for different reasons, presented the same prophecy.

Supra, p. 96 ad 438d: SCHÄFER, who compares systematically the various accounts of Joḥanan's flight, disputes BAER's (427) thesis and concludes that the rabbinic account is in some points dependent on either Josephus or on a source close to him.

(438e) MARIO MARAZZI: La profezia a Vespasiano. In: *L'Urbe* 39.6, 1976, pp. 12–17.

(438f) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller*. Heidelberg 1978.

MARAZZI (438e) has a popular appraisal of Josephus' prophecy in the light of similar messianic prophecies of the times as recorded in rabbinic writings and in the Dead Sea Peshar on Habakkuk.

VAN UNNIK (438f) stresses that to judge from Josephus' account of his surrender to Vespasian he was attempting to present himself as a prophet, since he employs various technical terms used of prophets. He thus sought to avoid the charge of being a traitor, the clear implication being that his surrender was necessary so that he might foretell the respective destinies of the Jews and of the Romans (War 3. 354). VAN UNNIK accounts for the extensive treatment which Josephus gives to Jeremiah by noting the implied comparison with himself, since both pleaded for Jerusalem to surrender and both were accused of being traitors.

### 8.7: Josephus and Justus of Tiberias

(447a) YARON DAN: Josephus Flavius and Justus of Tiberias. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 16.

DAN (447a) stresses how similar Josephus and Justus were in their general outlook, in their attitude toward historiography, and in their roles in the war, noting that Justus had defected to the Roman cause even before Josephus did and that he had been in the service of Agrippa II, who had fought on the side of the Romans.

### 9.1: Book-length Studies (1937–1979) dealing with Josephus in General

Supra, p. 107 ad 485: LEUTY attempts, finally, to demonstrate that many of Josephus' faults as a writer are shared by his contemporaries.

(488c) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller. Heidelberg 1978.

(488d) DAVID GOLDENBERG, rev.: WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK, Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 70, 1979–80, pp. 78–82.

(488e) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Flavius Josephus Revisited: The Man, His Writings, and His Significance. To appear in: WOLFGANG HAASE, ed., Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Vol. 2. 21.

VAN UNNIK (488c), in his book, despite the title, is hardly comprehensive, though he has several interesting suggestions, notably that Josephus' personal Hellenization may give us some clue as to the way that Christianity was Hellenized. To this, however, we may reply that the Hellenization of a learned Jewish intellectual is probably very different from the Hellenization of the much less learned and much less intellectual early Christians.

GOLDENBERG (488d) justly criticizes VAN UNNIK (488c) for his general disregard of rabbinic parallels.

I (488e) have an extensive survey, in effect an updating and critique of THACKERAY (479), under the following headings: bibliographical studies, the state of the text of Josephus, translations of Josephus, the Latin version, the Syriac version, the Slavonic version, Josippon, Josephus' life, Justus of Tiberias, Josephus as historian: his treatment of the Biblical period (especially extensive), Josephus' treatment of the post-Biblical period until the Jewish war (extensive), Josephus on the origins of Christianity (extensive), Josephus as historian: his treatment of the Jewish War (extensive), Josephus as apologist: Against Apion, the language and style of Josephus, and summary: the achievements of Josephan scholarship and desiderata.

### 9.3: Shorter General Accounts of Josephus' Life and Works in Books Other than Encyclopedias

- (565x) CLEMENS THOMA: *Christliche Theologie des Judentums*. Aschaffenburg 1978.  
 (565y) HANS CONZELMANN: *Heiden—Juden—Christen. Auseinandersetzungen in der Literatur der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 62), Tübingen 1981.  
 (565z) MICHAEL GRANT: *Greek and Latin Authors: 800 B.C.—A.D. 1000*. New York 1980.  
 (565za) MASASHI TAKAHASHI: *Philo and Josephus* (in Japanese). In: *Studies in the Christian Religion*, Doshisha University, School of Theology 1953, pp. 223–246.

THOMA (565x), pp. 128–129, has a popular, general survey of Josephus' life, work, and religious outlook.

CONZELMANN (565y), pp. 188–210, presents a survey of the high points of each of Josephus' works, noting, in particular, *τόποι*, with occasional critical comments.

GRANT (565z), pp. 237–240, summarizes the life of Josephus, comments critically on the nature and quality of his works, and presents a good brief bibliography. His view of Josephus' value is well balanced.

I have not seen TAKAHASHI (565za).

### 9.4: Josephus' Conception of Historiography in General

- (581h) SAMUEL SANDMEL: *Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity: The Question of the Comfortable Theory*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 50, 1979, pp. 137–148.  
 (581i) BERNARD THÉRON: *La méthode historique de Flavius Josèphe et sa signification théologique*. Diss., University of Paris. In progress.  
 (581j) PERE VILLALBA I VARNEDA: *El mètode històric de Flavi Josep*. Diss., Barcelona 1981.

SANDMEL (581h) cites Josephus as an author in whom there are many well-known Hellenistic rhetorical devices.

THÉRON (581i) is preparing a comprehensive treatment of the subject.

I have not seen VILLALBA I VARNEDA (581j).



### 10.0: Josephus' Treatment of the Biblical Period: the Problem of Josephus' Modifications of the Bible Generally

- (601 d) WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK: *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller*. Heidelberg 1978.  
 (601 e) DAVID GOLDENBERG, rev.: WILLEM C. VAN UNNIK, *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 70, 1979–80, pp. 78–82.  
 (601 f) SIGFRIED PEDERSEN: *Die Kanonfrage als historisches und theologisches Problem*. In: *Studia Theologica* 31, 1977, pp. 83–136.

VAN UNNIK (601 d) reasserts his point that Josephus' formula "neither adding nor omitting anything" means merely that the author has not falsified his handling of his sources and that it does not preclude the possibility of editing or explaining these sources.

GOLDENBERG (601 e) cites Talmudic parallels for this formula.

PEDERSEN (601 f), pp. 96–98, commenting on *Against Apion* 1. 42, says that the formula μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν within the Jewish tradition, as well as within the Christian tradition, is far more an expression of an ideal intention than a reflection of reality.

### 10.1: The Nature of Josephus' Modifications of the Bible in General

- (625 a) F. GERALD DOWNING: *Redaction Criticism: Josephus' Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels*. In: *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 8, 1980, pp. 46–65; 9, 1980, pp. 29–48.

DOWNING (625 a) remarks that Josephus' procedure in his redaction of the Bible supplies a model as to the method followed by the authors of the Gospels, especially Luke, whose stated intentions and tendencies are often identical with those of Josephus.

Supra, p. 130 ad 626 b: HOLLADAY stresses the strikingly uniform mold into which Josephus recasts each of these figures, noting that many of the characteristics which Josephus attributes to them are common to the stereotype of the Stoic wise man and, to an even greater degree, are indebted to popular, semi-philosophical ethics.

- (626 ea) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Hellenistic Literary and Apologetic Motifs in Josephus' Jewish Antiquities* (in Hebrew). In: *Moznaim o. s.* 16, 1943, pp. 205–210.

SCHALIT (626 ea), citing as an example Josephus' account of Moses' divorce of Zipporah, argues that in his retelling of the Bible Josephus remains fundamentally Jewish, though the veneer is Hellenistic.

### 10.3: Josephus' Use of the Septuagint and of Targumim for the Hexateuch

- (643 d) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus Flavius: A Biographical Essay*. In his: *The Rise and Fall of the Judaean State*. Vol. 3: 66 C. E. – 120 C. E. Philadelphia 1978. Pp. 385–417.

ZEITLIN (643d) concludes that for the 'Antiquities' Josephus used both a Hebrew text and the Septuagint.

### 10.5: Josephus' Version of Genesis for the pre-Abrahamic Period

Supra, p. 140 ad 661g: Furthermore, FRANXMAN assumes that Josephus had before him only the Hebrew text, whereas it is clear that Josephus used the Septuagint to an even greater degree. Moreover, in considering the sources of Josephus' additions, FRANXMAN cites midrashim, targumim, Apocrypha, and Pseudepigrapha, yet disregards Hellenistic writers who influenced his conception of historiography.

(661h) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Josephus' Commentary on Genesis. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 72, 1981–82, pp. 121–131.

I (661h) have an extended review of FRANXMAN in which I cite a number of examples of changes made by Josephus which have not been noted by FRANXMAN, who has, moreover, not answered the gnawing questions as to why Josephus claims not to have modified the Biblical account when he has manifestly done so, why he exhibits such a variety in his treatment of the Bible, and why he so often chooses to deviate from known exegetical traditions. FRANXMAN, however, is to be commended for his analysis of Josephus' style.

### 10.6: Josephus' Potrayal of Abraham, Melchisedek, and Isaac

(691h) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Abraham the General in Josephus. To appear in *Studia Philonica*.

I (691h) note that Josephus' stress on Abraham as a general is to be seen against the background of his own experience in military affairs and is in line with his presentation of Moses and of other Biblical characters. It was, moreover, important for Josephus to stress the military excellence of Abraham and of his other Biblical heroes since the Jews had been reproached with the charge of cowardice by such anti-Semites as Apollonius Molon (ap. Against Apion 2. 148). The rabbis, in contrast, stress the miraculous aid given to Abraham by G-d, thus detracting from the picture of Abraham the general.

### 10.8: Moses and the Exodus

(705a) CARL R. HOLLADAY: *Theios Aner* in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology. Diss., Yale University, New Haven 1974. Publ.: Missoula, Montana 1977.

(723l) CHARLES H. TALBERT: Prophecies of Future Greatness: the Contribution of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5–4:15. In: JAMES L. CRENSHAW and SAMUEL SANDMEL, edd., *The Divine Helmsman. Studies on G-d's Control of Human Events Presented to Lou H. Silberman*. New York 1980. Pp. 129–141.

(723m) PIERPAOLO FORNARO: Il cristianesimo oggetto di polemica indiretta in Flavio Giuseppe (Ant. Jud. IV 326). In: *Rivista di Studi Classici* 27, 1979, pp. 431–446.

HOLLADAY (705a), pp. 89–100, concludes that Josephus has reshaped Moses, as he has his other Biblical personalities, so that he is like the Stoic wise man, though in his own Biblical terms. In answer to the question as to why Josephus refers to Moses as θεῖος ἀνὴρ (Ant. 3. 180), a *hapax legomenon*, rather than as ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ, HOLLADAY suggests that perhaps he did so because of his anti-Samaritan sentiments, since the Samaritans identified Moses as the man of G-d. For Josephus, he states, the word θεῖος here shades off into ἱερός or ἅγιος or εὐσεβής and does not mean divine in the most literal sense, as we may see from his recasting of other Biblical personalities.

TALBERT (723l) asserts that the statements of the genealogy, family background, and miraculous childhood achievements in the career of Moses in the ‘Antiquities’, as well as Josephus’ account of himself in his ‘Life’, show that the Hellenistic biographical tradition made its impact upon Judaism before and alongside its impact on Christianity.

FORNARO (723m) suggests that Josephus’ version of the death of Moses is an indirect polemic against the Christian tradition of the death and resurrection of Jesus. We may comment, however, that whereas Josephus here (Ant. 4. 326) says that Moses wrote that he had died lest people say that he had returned to the Divinity, elsewhere (Ant. 1. 85) he says of Enoch, using the same phrase, that he had returned to the Divinity; hence such a phrase is unlikely to be part of a polemic against Jesus’ assumption. Moreover, even if it were, it would seem strange that such a veiled attack should have escaped all Christian and pagan and Jewish critics until FORNARO.

### 10.11: Joshua and Judges

(747a) F. GERALD DOWNING: Redaction Criticism: Josephus’ *Antiquities* and the Synoptic Gospels. In: *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 8, 1980, pp. 46–65; 9, 1980, pp. 29–48.

DOWNING (747a), in examining Josephus’ version of Joshua and Judges, notes the omission of discrepancies, repetitions, interruptions in the narrative, miracles and magic, inappropriate theology, and the apologetically awkward. Instead, Josephus has apologetically added harmony and continuity, emphasizing providence and prophecy, piety and moral uplift – all this told with interest and clarity. We may comment that DOWNING does not, however, give sufficient attention to Hellenizations, for example in the retelling of the Samson episode.

### 10.13: Josephus’ Biblical Text for Samuel through I Maccabees

(776b) EMANUEL TOV: The Textual Affiliations of 4QSam<sup>a</sup>. In: *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 14, 1979, pp. 37–53.

TOV (776b) accepts ULRICH's finding that Josephus' Biblical text for Samuel is based upon a Greek rather than upon a Hebrew archetype, on the ground that the Dead Sea manuscript of Samuel is close to the Septuagint and to Josephus' Biblical text; but he notes that we must not determine the relationship of the Dead Sea manuscript of Samuel to the Hebrew and Septuagint texts on the basis of statistics alone and that, in any case, ULRICH has downplayed the disagreements between the Dead Sea text and the Septuagint. He stresses that there is still need for a monograph on Josephus' Biblical text in the light of modern textual theories. We may, moreover, reiterate that any judgment on this question must remain provisional until we have the full publication of the Samuel scroll.

#### 10.14: Josephus on Specific Passages in Samuel and Kings

(783d) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Josephus' Portrait of Saul. In: Hebrew Union College Annual 53, 1982, pp. 45–99.

I (783d) have completed a long essay in which I conclude that Josephus' Saul is to be viewed as a Hellenized portrait of a Jewish hero, in line with the ideals of Isocrates, Theopompus, and Dionysius, with stress placed upon precisely those virtues which would appeal to a Greek audience. These qualities are first, the external ones of good birth and handsome stature; second, the four cardinal virtues of character – wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice; and third, the spiritual attribute (cf. Plato, Protagoras 349B) of piety. One may argue that these qualities are hardly distinctive with the Greeks and that they are surely important to Jews as well. To this we may reply that what is decisive is the phraseology which Josephus employs, which is so often reminiscent of Greek writers, notably Dionysius. Some may moreover, argue that it is unlikely that Josephus was influenced by Isocratean or Aristotelian theories of historiography, and that the chief factors were political, social, and religious. To this we may answer that Josephus' close dependence for so much of the 'Antiquities' upon Nicolaus of Damascus, a learned Peripatetic, as well as his demonstrated dependence upon Dionysius, himself a historian and a leading theoretician of historiography, must have had a basic influence upon him.

#### 10.15: Daniel

(824j) ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: Flavius Josephus and Alexander's Visit to Jerusalem. In: *Athenaeum* 57, 1979, pp. 442–448.

(824k) DAVID SATRAN: Daniel, Seer, Philosopher, Holy Man. In: GEORGE W. E. NICKELSBURG and HARRY M. ORLINSKY, edd. *Society of Biblical Literature: Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, no. 12: *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*, ed. by JOHN J. COLLINS and GEORGE W. E. NICKELSBURG, Chico, California, 1980, pp. 33–48.

The fact that Alexander in Josephus (Ant. 11. 337) is shown the Book of Daniel leads MOMIGLIANO (824j) to date the story in the Maccabean era, when he

thinks the Book of Daniel was composed. We may, however, reply that Josephus, as a traditional Jew, must have believed that the Book of Daniel was composed by Daniel in the Persian period. MOMIGLIANO says that the reference to Daniel was not part of the original story but that it was added by Josephus; but it would seem hard to believe that Josephus would add such an embarrassing detail as his veiled prophecy alluding to the impending overthrow of the Roman Empire. The fact that Josephus elsewhere (*Ant.* 10. 210) likewise alludes in veiled fashion to the prophecies in Daniel would similarly indicate his embarrassment at such an account and would make it unlikely that he himself would deliberately introduce such a reference.

SATRAN (824k) traces the development of the figure of Daniel from the Biblical text through the account of Josephus to a late reworking in pseudo-Epiphanius' *'Vitae Prophetarum'*. He concludes that in the *'Antiquities'* fasting takes on a distinctly Greco-Roman flavor paralleled in the Orphic life described by Plato (*Laws* 6. 782C–D) and in Philostratus' *'Life of Apollonius of Tyana'*. Josephus' praise of the effect of abstinence on the youths, he says, is a classic description of that balance of physical and mental training which becomes synonymous with philosophic existence. The disciplined pursuit of purification has brought Daniel to the supreme achievement of the Greco-Roman sage – the movement from human to divine wisdom. Finally, he notes that, in an extra-Biblical detail, Daniel requests dates, which he explains as one of the favorite fruits essential to a Pythagorean diet (cf. Philostratus 1. 21 and 2. 26).

### 10.16: The Prophetic Books

(828e) DANIEL R. SCHWARTZ: Priesthood and Priestly Descent: Josephus, *Antiquities* 10. 80. In: *Journal of Theological Studies* 32, 1981, pp. 129–135.

SCHWARTZ (828e) translates *Antiquities* 10. 80 thus: "Both [i.e. Jeremiah and Ezekiel] were priests by descent. But while Jeremiah lived in Jerusalem from the thirteenth year of Josiah's reign until the city and temple were destroyed, that which happened to this prophet [i.e. Ezekiel] we shall relate in its proper place". He remarks that Josephus seeks here to indicate that only Jeremiah could have functioned as a priest in Jerusalem. We may, however, reply that there is no reason why Ezekiel should not have been able to function as a priest while he was living in Jerusalem. Moreover, the reference to "this" (τοῦτον) prophet is most likely to the last-named prophet, that is Jeremiah, since normally, though admittedly not always, ἐκεῖνος refers to the "former"; and, indeed, if Josephus had intended a contrasting reference to Ezekiel the chances are that since he speaks of ὁ μὲν Ἰερεμίας he would have used a δέ in speaking of Ezekiel.

### 10.18: Particular Passages in Ezra and Nehemiah

(859a) MICHAEL HELTZER: A propos des banquets des rois achéménides et du retour d'exil sous Zorobabel. In: *Revue Biblique* 86, 1979, pp. 102–106.

HELTZER (859a), on the basis of a recently discovered cuneiform tablet, finds indirect confirmation for I (III) Esdras 3. 1–4. 58 and for Josephus (Ant. 11. 33–67) when they state that Darius I in the first year of his reign organized a banquet in Babylonia, that Darius, indeed, had a discussion with his bodyguards, that Zerubbabel actually had a mission as described in I (III) Esdras and in Josephus, and that the banquet described there and in the Book of Esther had a historical basis.

### 11.0: Josephus' Treatment of the Post-Biblical Period: General

Supra, p. 198 ad 911: ALLEGRO is tendentious, however, in showing sympathy for ancient Roman and modern Jewish authorities who see the danger in 'extremist' elements in Jewry of this period.

(919n) MICHAEL E. STONE: *Scriptures, Sects and Visions. A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts*. New York 1980.

(919o) FRITZ M. HEICHELHEIM: *Geschichte Syriens und Palästinas von der Eroberung durch Kyros II. bis zur Besitznahme durch den Islam (547 v. Chr.–641/2 n. Chr.)*. In: ALBERT DIETRICH, GEO WIDENGREN, and FRITZ M. HEICHELHEIM, *Orientalische Geschichte von Kyros bis Mohammed (Handbuch der Orientalistik, 1. Abteilung, 2. Band, 4. Abschnitt, 2. Lieferung*. Leiden 1966). Pp. 99–290.

(919oa) AVIGDOR TSCHERIKOWER: *History of Jerusalem in the Period of the Second Temple (in Hebrew)*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, ed., *The Book of Jerusalem: Jerusalem, its Natural Conditions, History and Development from the Origins to the Present Day*, vol. 1: *The Natural Conditions and the History of the City from its Origins to the Destruction of the Second Temple*. Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv 1956. Pp. 221–251.

STONE (919n) has a popular account, but with many thoughtful insights, of the religious history of Judea during the period of the Second Temple, with particular emphasis on non-normative Judaism, especially as revealed in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Nag Hammadi documents.

HEICHELHEIM (919o) has a semi-popular survey primarily of political history, with unusually full treatment not only of the Jews but also of the Arab states of Palestine during this period. He has an independent assessment based chiefly on a critical reading of Josephus for the period which the latter covers.

TSCHERIKOWER (919oa) briefly but factually traces the history of Jerusalem from the Persian through the Roman period.

### 11.2: Josephus' Treatment of the Hellenistic Period: General

Supra, p. 204 ad 933h: MOMIGLIANO (pp. 97–122) stresses that we have no trustworthy account of the wars between the Seleucids and the Jews from a Greek point of view. Josephus' source for this period, I Maccabees, cannot, he says, be taken as a contemporary witness to the facts. Consequently, MOMIGLI-

ANO prefers to see the confrontation with the Greeks as it is reflected in the Book of Daniel, that is, as one of apocalyptic proportions, rather than as one against Hellenism. We may, however, reply that there is no indication whether the point of view expressed in Daniel is more than that of a particular, and probably small, group of Jews, and that the question of dating the book remains the obstacle to any scholarly use of it in this connection.

- (933y) SAMUEL SANDMEL: Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity: The Question of the Comfortable Theory. In: Hebrew Union College Annual 50, 1979, pp. 137–148.
- (933z) MENAHEM STERN: Eretz Israel in the Hellenistic Period (in Hebrew). In: MENAHEM STERN, ed., The History of Eretz Israel, vol. 3: The Hellenistic Period and the Hasmonean State (332–37 B. C. E.). Jerusalem 1981. Pp. 9–190.
- (933za) MENAHEM STERN, ed. for the Historical Society of Israel: Hellenistic Views on Jews and Judaism. Jerusalem 1974.
- (933zb) SABBA AGOURIDES: Historia tōn Chronōn tēs kainēs Diathēkēs. Hellada, Rōmē, Ioudaia: Historiko kai pneumatiko hypobathro gia tēn meletēn tēs kainēs Diathēkēs. Athens 1980.
- (933zc) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: The Hellenistic Cities of Eretz Israel – Some New Aspects (in Hebrew). In: BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA, ed., The Seleucid Period in Eretz Israel: Studies on the Persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmonean Revolt. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 277–288.
- (933zd) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA, Ed.: The Seleucid Period in Eretz Israel: Studies on the Persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmonean Revolt (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1980.
- (933ze) HANS CONZELMANN: Heiden–Juden–Christen. Auseinandersetzungen in der Literatur der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 62). Tübingen 1981.

SANDMEL (933y) concludes that it is not possible to set up objective criteria by which one can differentiate Palestinian from Hellenistic Judaism.

STERN (933z) has a popular, lavishly illustrated but sober summary.

STERN (933za) has edited a collection of reprinted articles on various aspects of classical philo-Semitism and especially anti-Semitism, as seen in the Talmudic writings, Hecataeus of Abdera, Cicero, Tacitus, and Strabo.

AGOURIDES (933zb) surveys the Hellenistic world generally and, in particular, Hellenistic Judaism, both in Palestine and in the Diaspora, from the political, economic, social, cultural, and religious points of view.

APPLEBAUM (933zc) concludes that military considerations were behind the foundation of most of the cities of Palestine. In addition, he contends that the cities reacted to the spread of Judaism through the success of the proselyting movement.

BAR-KOCHVA (933zd) has edited a collection of essays on the Seleucid period and has written, pp. 7–17, a brief preface.

CONZELMANN (933ze) surveys the political situation of the Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman period, philo- and anti-Semitism in pagan Greek and Roman authors, Hellenistic Jewish literature (including Josephus), and the relations of Christians and Jews before Origen. He shows an unusually full and critical acquaintance with both the primary and secondary sources and outlines his material with commendable clarity.

## 12.0: Josephus on Alexander the Great

- (940e) ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: Flavius Josephus and Alexander's Visit to Jerusalem. In: *Athenaeum* 57, 1979, pp. 442–448.
- (940f) DAVID GOLAN: Josephus, Alexander's Visit to Jerusalem and Modern Historiography. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 5–7.

MOMIGLIANO (940e) asserts that there is no truth in the story of the visit of Alexander to Jerusalem, since it is not recorded in any respectable ancient source on Alexander and is full of impossible details. He notes that the version in Pseudo-Callisthenes has apparently been taken over from Josephus. He suggests that the account of Alexander's visit may have been invented in Egypt, where the name of the Macedonians was not so odious as it was in Palestine. We may, however, reply that the very fact that the rabbinic texts (Yoma 69a and parallels), apparently independently of Josephus, connect Alexander's visit with the Samaritans would seem to indicate that there must be at least a substratum of truth to the story. As to favorable statements about the Macedonians, Josephus, we may note, has positive things to say about Antiochus III, the father of Epiphanes; and there is no reason to doubt that he might have been similarly disposed to the founder himself of the empire.

GOLAN (940f), on the other hand, strongly affirms the historicity of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem. The spirit of the account, he claims, is consistent with what we find about Alexander in other sources.

## 12.1: Josephus' Version of the 'Letter of Aristeeas'

- (949f) F. GERALD DOWNING: Redaction Criticism: Josephus' *Antiquities* and the Synoptic Gospels. In: *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 8, 1980, pp. 46–65; 9, 1980, pp. 29–48.

DOWNING (949f) examines, in particular, Josephus' adaptation of the 'Letter of Aristeeas', and stresses that most of Josephus' changes in language are merely for change's sake and that very few phrases have been left intact.

## 12.3: Antiochus III

- (968f) SHELOMO BEN CHAIM: Fonti Storiche sul Sinedrio e sul titolo di Nassi. In: *Annuario di Studi Ebraici*, 1969–72, pp. 47–52.
- (968g) LUCIO TROIANI: Giuseppe, Antichità giudaica XII, 150. In: *Athenaeum* 58, 1980, pp. 465–466.

BEN CHAIM (968f) accepts the authenticity of the letter of Antiochus III (Ant. 12. 138–153).

I have not seen TROIANI (968g) who deals with a passage (Ant. 12. 150) from Antiochus III's letter to Zeuxis.



## 12.4: The Tobiads

- (983e) SUSAN NIDITCH: Father-Son Folktale Patterns and Tyrant Typologies in Josephus' *Ant.* 12. 160–222. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 32, 1981, pp. 47–55.

NIDITCH (983e) remarks that Josephus' account of the Tobiads follows a folktale pattern, which may also be seen in the Biblical accounts of Isaac, of Jacob, and of Joseph, as well as in Homer's 'Odyssey' and in a Turkish tale. This pattern involves the problem of an elder figure, the undertaking by a younger figure to solve it, his journey, his successes abroad and the solution of the problem, and his reward, namely a raise in status. This same pattern is found twice in Josephus' narrative of the Tobiads (*Ant.* 12. 160–222), once applied to Joseph and once to his son Hyrcanus, the second occurrence, as is usual in such tales, being more fantastic and grandiose. Similarly, in speaking of tyrants, Josephus gives a typical description reminiscent, for example, of Plato's 'Republic' (Book 8, 562A–9.576B). Consequently, it is the function of the historian to discern where the literary tradition ends and where the historical kernel begins. Regretfully, however, NIDITCH does not help us in the pursuit of this aim.

## 12.5: The Relationship between the Jews and the Spartans

- (991b) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Paris 1949.  
 (991c) ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: *Prime linee di storia della tradizione maccabaica*. Torino 1931.  
 (991d) MARTIN HENGEL: *Judentum und Hellenismus, Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jhr.s. v. Chr.* 2nd ed., Tübingen 1973. Trans. into English by JOHN BOWDEN: *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Philadelphia 1974.  
 (991e) YEHOShUA GUTMAN: *The Beginnings of Jewish Hellenistic Literature* (in Hebrew). Vol. 1. Jerusalem 1958.  
 (991f) JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN: *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (The Anchor Bible, 41). Garden City, New York 1976.

ABEL (991b), pp. 231–233, summarizes the major positions of scholars concerning the question of the relations of Jews and Spartans. He dismisses MOMIGLIANO's (991c), p. 143, attempt to connect Sparta and the Σπαρτοί (one of whom was Οὐδαῖος, whom MOMIGLIANO connects with the word 'Ιουδαῖος). ABEL, in reply, stresses that the legend of the Σπαρτοί treats of the origins of Thebes rather than of Sparta, and that Cleodemus, who connects Abraham with Heracles, says nothing about Sparta.

HENGEL (991d), vol. 1, p. 72, finding significance in the fact that Jason, the author of the Hellenistic reform in Jerusalem, took refuge in Sparta, concludes that the legend of an affinity between Jews and Spartans must go back well into pre-Maccabean times, presumably to the circle of the reformers. He, vol. 2, p. 50, rejects the suggestion of GUTMAN (991e), pp. 108–111, that the initiative came from the Spartans, who had learned from Hecataeus of the common exodus of the Jews and of the Danaans from Egypt. HENGEL finds the origin of the

legend in Greco-Jewish mythographers such as Cleodemus-Malchus; but, we may reply, Cleodemus does not mention Sparta at all.

GOLDSTEIN (991f), pp. 444–462, in seeking to explain why the Maccabees sought an alliance with the Spartans, remarks that Sparta was one of the few political units that enjoyed unclouded Roman favor and cites a parallel in the Greek city of Lampsakos, which likewise appealed to the Romans on the ground that they were friends of the Massilians, the staunch allies of the Romans. GOLDSTEIN argues that the letter of Areus is authentic. He notes, in particular, a wide variety of particles and an extensive use of participles – features not generally found in Greek translations from Hebrew, though he admits that the letter has a Semitic flavor and could have been drawn up in Aramaic and that Areus could have known of Cleodemus' work, as well as of Pseudo-Hecataeus' 'On Abraham'. Furthermore, he remarks, a forger understands the document he has produced, whereas Jonathan and his staff misunderstood it, since they write that the letter of Onias speaks of an alliance, a term nowhere mentioned in the letter. Finally, he asserts that I Maccabees 14. 20 proves Josephus (Ant. 13. 166) to be wrong on Spartan protocol in the time of Jonathan.

## 12.6: Josephus' Version of I Maccabees

- (1009l) MENAHEM STERN: The Books of the Maccabees and 'Jewish Antiquities' as Sources for the Hasmonean Revolt and the Hasmonean State (in Hebrew). In his: The Documents of the Revolt of the Hasmoneans. Tel-Aviv 1965. Pp. 7–11. Rpt. in: BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA, ed., The Seleucid Period in Eretz Israel: Studies on the Persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmonean Revolt. Tel-Aviv 1980, Pp. 37–48.
- (1009m) SAM K. WILLIAMS: Jesus' Death as Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1972. Publ. (Harvard Dissertations in Religion, 2): Missoula, Montana 1975.
- (1009n) ISAIAH GAFNI: On the Use of I Maccabees by Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: Zion 45, 1980, pp. 81–95.
- (1009o) WILLIAM R. FARMER: Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period. New York 1958.
- (1009p) KLAUS-DIETRICH SCHUNCK: 1. Makkabäerbuch (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit, Bd. 1, Lieferung 4). Gütersloh 1980.

STERN (1009l) contends that Josephus utilized Nicolaus, in addition to I Maccabees, as a major source for his account of the Maccabean revolt and for the Hasmonean kings.

WILLIAMS (1009m), pp. 75–76, notes that Josephus (Ant. 12. 255) elaborates in macabre detail beyond the account of his source, I Maccabees, the suffering of those who refused to acquiesce in the decrees of Antiochus Epiphanes. In this he shows a greater degree of fascination with pain and dying than does Daniel or I Maccabees or the Assumption of Moses and is reminiscent of II and IV Maccabees.

GAFNI (1009n) notes that Josephus has introduced two major changes in his version of I Maccabees, namely that whereas I Maccabees ascribes the victory of the Maccabees to G-d, Josephus attributes it to their piety and to the righteous-

ness of their cause, and, secondly, that whereas in I Maccabees the Jews fight for victory, in Josephus their highest goal is martyrdom. In these respects GAFNI, in disagreement with FARMER (1009o), differentiates the Maccabees from the revolutionaries of Josephus' own day. We may comment that Josephus' depiction of the Sicarii who committed suicide at Masada as martyrs is at variance with this. As to Josephus' changes from I Maccabees, most plausibly, we may suggest, they are due to family traditions, since he was a descendant of the Hasmoneans.

SCHUNCK (1009p), pp. 290–291, concludes that Josephus' text goes back to a Greek version of I Maccabees, as well as to Nicolaus of Damascus and to his own text of the 'War'. He frequently cites Josephus in reconstructing proper names and in identifying place-names.

## 12.8: Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) and the Background of the Maccabean Revolt

Supra, p. 229 ad 1019: MOEHRING's translation of BICKERMANN's original text omits the footnotes and two appendices, adds supplementary references and a detailed index, and corrects some points in the text.

- (1022a) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER: The Antiochus Persecutions: The Main Problem (in Hebrew). In: *Eshkolot* 1, 1954, pp. 86–109. Rpt. in: BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA, ed., *The Seleucid Period in Eretz Israel: Studies on the Persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmonean Revolt*. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 109–129.
- (1051o) HERSH GOLDWURM: Background. In: HERSH GOLDWURM, MEIR ZLOTOWITZ, and NOSSON SCHERMAN, *Chanukah – Its History, Observance, and Significance: A Presentation Based upon Talmudic and Traditional Sources*. Brooklyn 1981. Pp. 33–90.
- (1051p) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Hanukkah Reconsidered. In: *The American Mizrahi Woman* 54. 3, December 1981, pp. 6–7.

TCHERIKOVER (1022a) astutely notes that Antiochus' decrees did not come before the revolt, but rather that the revolt came before the decrees.

GOLDWURM (1051o) presents a popular survey of the history of the Maccabean revolt, the dating of Hanukkah, and the duration of the Hasmonean monarchy, relying upon rabbinic sources where there are contradictions with Josephus and with the First Book of Maccabees.

I (1051p) present a popular survey, relying chiefly on I Maccabees and on Josephus in stressing the civil strife between the Hellenists and the traditionalists as the background of the events culminating in the Maccabean revolt.

## 12.9: Mattathias and Judah Maccabee

- (1057) BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA: The Second Bacchides Expedition and the Battle of Edesa (in Hebrew). In: *Beth Mikra* 19, 1974, pp. 419–434. Rpt. with a number of revisions and additions in BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA, ed., *The Seleucid Period in Eretz Israel: Studies on the Persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmonean Revolt*. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 155–189.

BAR-KOCHVA (1057) argues against those who try to reconcile the statement of I Maccabees 9. 5, that Judah Maccabee escaped at Elasa prior to his battle with

Bacchides, with Josephus' remark (Ant. 12. 422), that he concentrated his forces at Berzetho. BAR-KOCHVA refuses to assign any independent value to Josephus and says that Josephus has a proto-Lucianic reading. In view, however, of Josephus' general interest and accuracy in military and topographical details and in view of his descent from the Maccabees, Josephus' account, we may remark, should have some value for this important episode.

## 12.10: Antiochus V, VI, and VII

- (1063c) TESSA RAJAK: Roman Intervention in a Seleucid Siege of Jerusalem? In: Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 22, 1981, pp. 65–81.  
 (1063d) JOSEPH SIEVERS: The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters from Mattathias to John Hyrcanus I. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1981.

RAJAK (1063c) suggests that the reason why Antiochus VII Sidetes withdrew after invading Palestine in 135–134 B.C.E. was Roman pressure. She conjectures that the Antiochus mentioned in the decree of the Roman Senate barring Antiochus' troops from Jewish territory is Antiochus VII, and that the Romans had expressed support for him some time before (in Ant. 13. 262 she reads ὑπέρ for ὑπὸ Ἀντιόχου) the reassertion of the alliance with the Jews. We may suggest that if so the reason why Josephus did not state this was that he, as a supporter of the Romans, was embarrassed by this ambiguous role of the Romans. Or, alternatively, as does SIEVERS (1063d), pp. 209–214, we may question whether the Romans did anything at all, since Sidetes may have concluded that Hyrcanus was actually the best Jewish ruler that he could find and that the Syrians were in no position to pursue the war with him to the bitter end.

## 12.12: Anti-Semitism in Ptolemaic Egypt

- (1084ia) ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: Juifs et Grecs. In: LÉON POLIAKOV, ed., Ni Juif ni Grec; entretiens sur le racisme. Paris 1978. Pp. 47–63.

MOMIGLIANO (1084ia), drawing chiefly on 'Against Apion', presents a brief survey of the contacts between Greeks and Jews from the Biblical through the Greco-Roman period, with emphasis on Alexandrian anti-Semitism. He notes that since Josephus' mission was to write the history of the Jews for the pagans, he could achieve his goal only by adopting Greek historiographical models.

## 12.13: The Hasmonean Kings Generally

- (1092ma) JOSHUA EFRON: Studies of the Hasmonean Period: Seven Topics (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1980.

- (1092mb) URIEL RAPPAPORT: The Hasmonean State (160–37 B.C.E.) (in Hebrew). In: MENAHEM STERN, ed., *The History of Eretz Israel*, vol. 3: *The Hellenistic Period and the Hasmonean State* (332–37 B.C.E.). Jerusalem 1981. Pp. 191–273.
- (1092mc) JOSEPH SIEVERS: *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters from Mattathias to John Hyrcanus I*. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1981.
- (1092md) THOMAS FISCHER: Rom und die Hasmonäer. Ein Überblick zu den politischen Beziehungen 164–37 v. Chr. In: *Gymnasium* 88, 1981, pp. 139–150.

EFRON (1092ma) has reprinted a number of essays on the Hasmonean revolt, the Hasmonean kings, and religious institutions and literature during this period.

RAPPAPORT (1092mb) has a popular, beautifully illustrated account of the Hasmonean kings, with special regard to archaeology and numismatics.

SIEVERS (1092mc), in a careful and sober dissertation, concludes that Josephus' account of the Maccabean revolt contains a number of elements of popular legend. He notes that whereas I Maccabees (6. 44) glorifies the death of Judas' brother Eleazar, who was crushed by an elephant in the mistaken belief that the king was riding on it, Josephus (War 1. 42–45) regards this as an act of folly and ascribes Judas' defeat not only to the superior numbers of the enemy but also to their luck. As SIEVERS, p. 87, remarks, Josephus may reflect the viewpoint of his source, but he may also seek thus, by attributing the victory to fortune, to free Judas from blame.

I have not seen FISCHER (1092md).

## 12.17: Simon the Hasmonean

- (1102e) JOSEPH SIEVERS: *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters from Mattathias to John Hyrcanus I*. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1981.

SIEVERS (1102e) notes that Josephus is contradictory in his accounts of Simon's accession. He remarks that Josephus is independent of I Maccabees in his statement that Simon led a successful guerrilla campaign against Cendebaeus; but, as SIEVERS, p. 97, indicates, it is doubtful that Simon at his age would have been able to lead such a campaign. Josephus' source for such details, he says, was a romantic but inaccurate 'Story of the Hasmoneans'; and it was upon this narrative, in large part, that Josephus relied when the account in I Maccabees ceased.

## 12.18: John Hyrcanus

- (1107i) JOSEPH SIEVERS: *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters from Mattathias to John Hyrcanus I*. Diss., Columbia University, New York 1981.

SIEVERS (1107i), pp. 211–212, concludes that Josephus' chronology is unreliable in connection with Hyrcanus' seizure of money from the tomb of David and with his hiring of mercenaries, and that (pp. 225–226) his account of Hyrcanus' attitude toward the Pharisees is self-contradictory.

## 12.19: Alexander Jannaeus

- (1138n) JOSHUA EFRON: Shimon ben Shetach and King Jannaeus (in Hebrew). In: MENAHEM DORMAN, SHMUEL SAFRAI and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *Gedaliah Alon Memorial Volume*. Tel-Aviv 1970. Pp. 69–132. Rpt. in his: *Studies of the Hasmonean Period: Seven Topics*. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 131–144.
- (1138o) DAVID JESELSOHN: *Hever Yehudim – A New Jewish Coin*. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 112, 1980, pp. 11–17.
- (1138p) PINKHOS CHURGIN: *Studies in the Time of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). New York 1949.
- (1138q) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *History of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). Vol. 3. Jerusalem 1949.

EFRON (1138n) concludes that the religious split between the Hasmoneans and the Pharisees goes back to John Hyrcanus, and that Josephus attempted to fuse various disputes between the Hasmoneans and the Pharisees into a single dispute.

JESELSOHN (1138o) says that it is unlikely that the *Hever Yehudim* coins were minted during the reign of John Hyrcanus. A dating, ca. 88 B.C.E., within the period of Alexander Jannaeus, on the other hand, fits in with Josephus (War 1. 90–95 and Ant. 13. 372–379), according to which Jannaeus' opponents, the Pharisees, called to their aid Demetrius III of Syria, and Jannaeus lost the ensuing battle and had to flee. At this point, says JESELSOHN, the Pharisees were masters of Jerusalem and of the royal mint and issued these coins.

CHURGIN (1138p) is distrustful of Josephus' account of the Hasmonean kings because it is based on non-Jewish sources. In particular, he feels that Josephus' account of Jannaeus' crucifixion of the Pharisees is untrustworthy, inasmuch as there is no similar account in any Jewish source. In general, he says, Josephus sought to depreciate the Hasmoneans because they were so highly nationalistic, whereas he sought to ingratiate himself to the Romans. We may remark, however, that while one of Josephus' sources for this period – perhaps his chief source – may have been Nicolaus of Damascus, it was surely not his only source, since, as a member himself of the Hasmonean family, Josephus must have had some oral traditions, and, in particular, had access to traditions retained by his friend and fellow-Hasmonean, King Agrippa II. Moreover, the extant Jewish sources for this period, namely in the Talmudic corpus, are so scanty that it seems unfair to question Josephus' reliability merely because he is not corroborated there. As to depreciating the Hasmoneans, the fact that Josephus asserts his pride as a descendant of theirs would indicate that he would do everything in his power to praise them if he could. Finally, the Talmud (Berakhoth 29a) does speak of Jannaeus' wickedness and specifically (Kiddushin 66a) of his massacre of all the sages, though it does not, to be sure, specify crucifixion as the means that he employed.

KLAUSNER (1138q), p. 155, also distrusts Josephus' statement about Jannaeus' atrocities, since he feels that crucifixion could hardly have been resorted to by a Jew. Instead he blames the Pharisees, who, he says, were guilty of treason in inviting foreign troops to aid them in their religious struggles. We may remark that a good Jew could hardly have resorted to crucifixion; but the Hasmoneans

had become so secularized that their Jewishness was quite secondary to their political ambitions.

### 13.0: The Roman Period: General

Supra, p. 265 ad 1169m: MERTENS has a brief handbook listing the major events of each year from 63 B.C.E. to C.E.

Supra, p. 266 ad 1169sc: MARSH has a popular account in which he cites Josephus (in an eighteenth-century translation) uncritically in connection with Pilate.

- (1169sg) CARROLL V. NEWSOM: *The Roots of Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1979.
- (1169sh) SEAN FREYNE: *The World of the New Testament* (New Testament Message, 2). Wilmington, Delaware 1980.
- (1169si) MARINA PUCCI: On the Tendentiousness of Josephus' Historical Writing. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 10–11.
- (1169sj) MENAHEM STERN: Josephus and the Roman Empire. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981. Abstracts. The Center of the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 8.
- (1169sk) H. GUEVARA: *La resistencia judía contra Roma en la epoca de Jesús*. Diss., Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Roma. Meiningen, West Germany 1981 (typewritten).
- (1169sl) ARYEH KASHER: New Light on the Jewish Part in the Alexandrian War of Julius Caesar (in Hebrew). In: *Yedion: Newsletter of the World Union of Jewish Studies* 14–15, June 1979, pp. 15–23.

NEWSOM (1169sg), pp. 95–124, presents a popular account by a non-specialist who is in the field of cultural anthropology. He is generally uncritical in his acceptance of Josephus.

FREYNE (1169sh) has an introductory study of the political and religious scene of the Jews, both in Palestine and in the Diaspora, during the first century.

PUCCI (1169si), on the basis of a comparison between the texts of Josephus and Josippon, concludes that wherever Josephus had two or more sources from which to choose, he preferred the source which presented Jewish actions from the most positive point of view in relation to Rome. Josephus, says PUCCI, ignored those matters, which, he felt, were not well known at Rome but which could implicate the Jewish people. We may, however, comment that all that the difference may show is the tendentiousness of Josippon, who is quite possibly not based on reliable sources at all.

STERN (1169sj) notes that, surprisingly, despite Josephus' apparent conviction that G-d favored victory for the Romans, he shows almost no sign of sympathy for Roman civilization, nor does Josephus repeat the commonly stated view (found even occasionally in the Talmudic corpus) that the Roman rule was for the benefit of their subjects.

I have not seen GUEVARA (1169sk), who, according to the summary in 'New Testament Abstracts', examines in detail Josephus' evidence, as against other sources (Philo, Tacitus, rabbinic literature, and the New Testament), for the extent to which Palestine between 4 B.C.E. and 41 C.E. was revolutionary.

KASHER (1169sl) notes the silence of Greek and Roman writers with regard to the help given to Caesar by the Jews, which is mentioned by Josephus (War 1. 187–194, Ant. 14. 127–139). He accepts Josephus' version since it is confirmed by the topographical evidence. We may cite a parallel to this in the silence of Roman writers concerning the role of Agrippa I in the accession of Claudius. In both of these cases, we may suggest, Josephus may have exaggerated the actual role played by Jews.

### 13.1: Anti-Semitism during the Roman Period

(1169va) MENAHEM STERN: Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, Edited with Introductions, Translations and Commentary. Vol. 1: From Herodotus to Plutarch. Jerusalem 1974. Vol. 2: From Tacitus to Simplicius. Jerusalem 1980.

(1169vb) THÉODORE REINACH: Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au Judaïsme. Paris 1895; rpt. Hildesheim 1963.

STERN (1169va) has an exhaustive collection of texts, much fuller than that of REINACH (1169vb), and with much more thorough and judicious commentaries and bibliographies.

### 13.5: Hyrcanus II and Pompey

(1189c) JOSHUA EFRON: The Hasmonean Decline and Christianity (in Hebrew). In his: Studies of the Hasmonean Period: Seven Topics. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 195–249.

EFRON (1189c) comments on Pompey's conquest of Jerusalem in the light of Strabo, Josephus, and the Psalms of Solomon.

### 13.7: The Documents in 'Antiquities', Book 14

(1206k) MENAHEM STERN: The Documents in the Jewish Literature of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: BEZALEL BAR-KOCHVA, ed., The Seleucid Period in Eretz Israel: Studies on the Persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Hasmonean Revolt. Tel-Aviv 1980. Pp. 49–64.

STERN (1206k) concludes that there is no basis for the hypothesis that Josephus obtained his documents directly from archives.

### 13.9: Antipater

(1209c) GIDEON FUKS: On the Reliability of a Notice in Josephus. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa,



March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 14.

FUKS (1209c) notes that whereas *Antiquities* 14. 10 says that Antipater made an alliance of close friendship with the Nabataeans and the inhabitants of Ashkelon and Gaza, it is clear that Alexander Jannaeus and the inhabitants of Gaza, at any rate, were hostile to each other during the opening months of his rule. Josephus, he concludes, who apparently used a pro-Herodian source, such as was utilized by Nicolaus of Damascus, cannot, therefore, be relied upon here. We may however, suggest that, in the volatile international politics of the time, a shift from hostility to alliance was not unusual, especially when, as here with Antipater, there was a major change in the leadership of a state.

#### 14.0: Herod: General Treatments

- (1214a) ADOLPH A. FEINBERG: Herod, King of Jews. Cincinnati 1938 (mimeographed).  
 (1265j) ALEKSANDER KRAWCZUK: Herodowy mecenat. In: *Meander* 33, 1978, pp. 3–5.  
 (1265k) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: The Family of Herod in the Christian Tradition – A Chapter in the History of Party Accusation in the Period of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: *Ha-umma* 1, 1963, pp. 579–598.

FEINBERG (1214a) presents a very much simplified discussion, in outline form for use by debaters, of the affirmative and negative cases of the topic: Resolved that the appointment of Herod as king of the Jews was harmful to the best interests of the Jewish people.

I have not seen KRAWCZUK (1265j), who apparently deals with Herod as patron of literature and of the arts.

SCHALIT (1265k), who traces the history of the hatred toward Herod's family, prefers to follow Josephus, who depicts Herod as an Edomite, rather than Justin Martyr, who says that he came from Ashkelon.

#### 14.5: Herod's Trial before the Sanhedrin

- (1277b) AKIVA GILBOA: The Intervention of Sextus Julius Caesar, Governor of Syria, in the Affair of Herod's Trial. In: *Scripta Classica Israelica* 5, 1979–80, pp. 185–194. Trans. into Hebrew (with some revisions) in: AHARON OPPENHEIMER, URIEL RAPPAPORT, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Jerusalem 1980. Pp. 98–107.

GILBOA (1277b) interprets War 1. 211 and *Antiquities* 14. 170 to mean not that Sextus wished to have Herod cleared by the Sanhedrin of the charge (δίκη) of homicide but rather that he sought to have been freed from a trial, since this is the meaning of the word δίκη in the section just before this (*Ant.* 14. 169). He notes that the word δίκη never elsewhere in Josephus has the meaning "charge". We may add that an examination of the passages cited by LIDDELL–SCOTT–JONES' Greek Lexicon similarly reveals that the word never has the meaning "charge". Moreover, Julius Caesar had granted to Antipater and to

his descendants a choice of jurisdiction between local courts and a Roman proconsular tribunal; and it was this of which Herod availed himself when he appealed to the Roman governor.

#### 14.10: The Place of Sports in Herod's Politics

Supra, p. 293 ad 1288a–b: LÄMMER concludes that Herod's actions had political motives and that they must have been connected with his trip to Rome, which fell in the year of the Olympics.

#### 14.11: Herod's Building Program

Supra, p. 294 ad 1297b: AVIGAD, in a popular, lavishly illustrated article, commenting on the excavation of houses dating from 37 B.C.E. to 70 C.E., notes that we can be precise as to the date when they were destroyed, since Josephus reports that the upper city resisted for a month after the burning of the Temple. The objects that have been found, he remarks, permit the reconstruction of the daily life of the Jews, of whom one was probably a priest.

- (1297d) EHUD NETZER: Herod's Building Projects – State Necessity or Personal Necessity (in Hebrew). In: *Cathedra* 15, 1980, pp. 38–51 and 61–67.
- (1297e) LEE I. LEVINE: Toward an Evaluation of Herod the Builder (in Hebrew). In: *Cathedra* 15, 1980, pp. 52–55.
- (1297f) MAGEN BROSHI: Does 'State Necessity' Contradict 'Personal Necessity'? (in Hebrew). In: *Cathedra* 15, 1980, p. 56.
- (1297g) YORAM TSAFRIR: On the Symmetry of Herodium, 'Megalomania' in Herod's Architecture and Roman Technology in Its Formation (in Hebrew). In: *Cathedra* 15, 1980, pp. 56–60.
- (1297h) TH. A. BUSINK: Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes. Eine archäologisch-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus. Vol. 2: Von Ezechiel bis Middot. Leiden 1980. Pp. 701–1611.

NETZER (1297d) concludes that while Herod is to be viewed as one who built in the Hellenistic fashion, he also infused his personal ideas into his structures.

LEVINE (1297e), noting that Herod built Caesarea for reasons of state necessity, concludes that the public aspect was Herod's dominant motive. In particular, he stresses that Herod saw himself as an integral part of the Roman world.

BROSHI (1297f), noting that Herod squandered his money on thirteen places outside Palestine, concludes that Herod's motives in building were, for the most part, a mixture of state and personal necessity.

TSAFRIR (1297g) sees Roman influence on Herod's building program and techniques and concludes that the beginning of the Roman era in the land of Israel is to be seen not with Pompey's conquest but with Herod's ascendancy.

BUSINK (1297h), pp. 1017–1062, discusses Herod's building program in Jerusalem (other than the Temple), Herodium, Masada, Samaria, Caesarea, and Jericho.

#### 14.13: Herod's Trial against His Sons

- (1302c) ALFRED MORDECHAI RABELLO: *Hausgericht* in the House of Herod the Great? (in Hebrew). In: AHARON OPPENHEIMER, URIEL RAPPAPORT, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume. Jerusalem 1980. Pp. 119–135.

RABELLO (1302c), in opposition to KUNKEL (1302b), argues that the council of relatives and friends before whom took place the trials of Herod's wife Mariamne (Ant. 15. 228–231), that of his sons Aristobulus and Alexander (Ant. 16. 367–372), and that of his son Antipater (Ant. 17. 89–145, 182–187) was not a *Hausgericht* (domestic tribunal), in which he exercised authority over an adulterous wife and rebellious sons, but rather a typically Hellenistic royal tribunal. RABELLO notes, in particular, that the phrase συγγενεῖς καὶ φίλοι ("relatives and friends") arose in the kingdom of Persia and passed from there to the Hellenistic monarchies.

#### 14.15: Herod and Cleopatra

- (1307g) EMIL LUDWIG: Cleopatra, Geschichte einer Königin. Amsterdam 1937. Trans. into English by BERNARD MIAL: Cleopatra, The Story of a Queen. New York 1937.  
(1307h) ERNLE BRADFORD: Cleopatra. New York 1972.

LUDWIG (1307g), in his lively, popular, psycho-history, discusses, pp. 226, 300–301, the alleged affair of Herod and Cleopatra without committing himself.

BRADFORD (1307h) disbelieves Josephus' story that Cleopatra attempted to seduce Herod, since she was pregnant by Antony, through whom she was intent on becoming empress of the world; hence this petty king of Judaea can hardly have meant anything to her. It is equally unlikely that Herod, famed for his skill at diplomacy, planned to murder her.

#### 14.17: Herod's Death

- (1315a) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: The Death of Herod the Great. In: Classical Philology 76, 1981, pp. 25–34.

LADOUCEUR (1315a) stresses that Josephus' description of Herod's death is a stereotype of the death scenes in antiquity of the famous and of the infamous. In comparing Josephus' two accounts (War 1. 656 and Antiquities 17. 168–170) of Herod's death, he cites a number of indications, in the second account, of the influence of the description of the plague of Thucydides (2. 47–54), a fact

that may help us to understand several difficult points in Antiquities 17. 168–169. Hence, he says, we should not attempt to analyze the precise disease. In particular, the elaboration and slight altering of certain symptoms in Josephus' account may well be designed to show, in line also with the Jewish doctrine of retribution, that Herod was being punished for sexual offences. We may comment that, if indeed this were so, we would have expected Josephus, who constantly seeks to draw morals from history, especially in the case of Herod, to point this out.

#### 14.21: Herod Antipas and Herodias

- (1340b) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: The Question of Josephus' Historical Reliability in the Two Test Cases: – Antipatris of Kefar-Saba and Antipatris of Caesarea. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 15.

APPLEBAUM (1340b) notes that Josephus conveniently omits the real reason for Antipas' removal from office after his attempt to develop Jewish cities in Judea, namely that this effort was contrary to Roman official policy during this period.

#### 15.0: Josephus on Parthian Affairs

- (1352f) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: Parthia in the *Bellum Iudaicum*. In: Abstracts: American Philological Association, One Hundred and Thirteenth Annual Meeting, San Francisco, California, December 27–30, 1981. Chico, California 1981. P. 21.

LADOUCEUR (1352f) notes that through careful arrangement and similar structuring of incidents Josephus seeks to contrast Rome and Parthia so as to stress to his fellow-Jews that they should rely not on the delusive hope of Parthian intervention but on the fact of Roman power in order to preserve their privileges. In this he stands in contrast to contemporary writers of apocalypses and oracles. Yet, he is more than an imperial apologist, and in technical matters he often proves more reliable than Tacitus. We may comment that Josephus' downgrading of the Parthians may also have been influenced by the long-standing rivalry between the Jews of Palestine and those of Parthia (Babylonia), in which his attachment to the former is clear, as well as by the fact that Herod, the hated rival of his ancestors, the Hasmoneans, had favored the Babylonian Jews.

#### 15.2: Josephus on Arab Affairs

Supra, p. 308 ad 1358c: WACKS, commenting on a coin minted in 54 B.C.E. similar to the coin of the Arab king Aretas issued by Aulus Plautius, explains the enigmatic inscription *Bacchius Iudaeus* as referring to Aristobulus II,

who sent Pompey a present consisting of a golden vine, which, he suggests, led to his being called Bacchus after the god of wine. The name Bacchius reflects the saying “*Bithus contra Bacchium*”, in allusion to two celebrated gladiators of equal strength (Horace, Epistles 1. 7. 20), a veiled reference to the civil war between the brothers Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II.

### 15.7: The Roman Procurators before Pontius Pilate

- (1373c) RAFAEL YANKELEVITCH: The Auxiliary Troops from Caesarea and Sebaste – A Decisive Factor in the Rebellion against Rome (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 49, 1979–80, pp. 33–42.
- (1373d) URIEL RAPPAPORT: The Relations between Jews and Non-Jews and the Great War against Rome (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 47, 1977–78, pp. 1–14.

YANKELEVITCH (1373c) takes issue with RAPPAPORT (1373d), who had postulated that the procurators’ favoritism toward non-Jews was due to the anti-Semitism of the Hellenistic world generally, and asks why the procurators did not realize that anti-Semitism did not make sense in view of the number and importance of the Jews. Instead, he concludes that the procurators favored the non-Jews because their auxiliary troops, who were recruited by local conscription, were composed of Gentiles stemming mainly from Sebaste and Caesarea and included no Jews, inasmuch as Julius Caesar had exempted Jews from military service because of the support that Hyrcanus II had rendered him. We may respond that anti-Semitism has never made sense, since it is, above all, an irrational phenomenon, but that this has not prevented its frequent appearance in history, including the Roman period.

### 15.8: Pontius Pilate: General

- (1389j) J.-P. LÉMONON: Pilate et le gouvernement de la Judée. Textes et monuments. *Études Bibliques*. Diss., University of Lyons, 1979. Published: Paris 1981.
- (1389k) DAVID FLUSSER: A Literary Approach to the Trial of Jesus. In: *Judaism* 20, 1971, pp. 32–36.
- (1389l) GERARD S. SLOYAN: The Last Days of Jesus. In: *Judaism* 20, 1971, pp. 56–68.

I have not seen LÉMONON (1389j), who apparently has a comprehensive treatment.

FLUSSER (1389k) remarks that Pilate’s behavior toward Jesus, as described in the Gospels, fits his behavior in relation to the Jews on the other occasions as we know them from Josephus, since we see the same mixture of cruelty and weakness.

SLOYAN (1389l), on the other hand, believes that Pilate’s vacillation in connection with Jesus is out of character with anything we know of him, since, he says, Josephus describes him as cruel, forceful, and self-willed and bears this out by recounting numerous incidents in which he was embroiled. A close reading of Josephus’ text, however, supports FLUSSER’s point of view; and, we may add, it is

hardly likely that Pilate would have stayed on as procurator for ten years if he had been utterly inflexible.

### 15.9: The Episode of Pilate's Introduction of the Emperor's Standards into Jerusalem

- (1398c) DANIEL R. SCHWARTZ: Josephus and Philo on Pontius Pilate. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 17.

SCHWARTZ (1398c) argues that Josephus and Philo are talking about two different events. He stresses, in particular, Philo's apologetic motive.

### 15.12: Agrippa I

Supra, p. 326 ad 1444b: WIRGIN's suggestion that Agrippa believed that he was a Messiah is based upon Agrippa's eagerness to act as a true and pious Jew after his appointment as king, his tears at the festival of Tabernacles, the fact that he personally carried the first fruits as an offering to the Temple, his project of the wall that would have made Jerusalem impregnable, and his behavior during the festival at Caesarea shortly before his death. We may, however, object that the rabbis would hardly have praised him if he had so regarded himself when he was not even descended from David, as the Messiah must be, according to rabbinic tradition. WIRGIN finds questionable support for his thesis in coins which have hitherto been assigned to the revolt of 66–70.

### 15.14: The Citizenship of the Alexandrian Jews and Claudius' Edict

- (1488s) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1968. Trans. into English (revised) (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity, 28): Leiden 1979.

APPLEBAUM (1488s) concludes that nearly all of Josephus' statements with regard to the citizenship status of the Jews in Alexandria and in other Greek cities can be understood to refer to their status as members of their own organized communities. It is highly improbable, he says, that any sizable number of Jews during this period were interested in obtaining citizenship in the Greek *polis* of Alexandria, which was in almost constant conflict with the Jewish inhabitants.

### 15.17: The Jews of Asia Minor

Supra, p. 339 ad 1492d–e: ROTH-GARSON (1492d), co-ordinating Josephus with epigraphic evidence in discussing the civic status of the Jews in

Asia Minor, asserts that though Josephus' knowledge was generally poor, yet there is in him no deliberate attempt at distortion, though his terminology is imprecise because of his desire to stress the equality between the Jews and the Greeks. She stresses that no evidence has yet been found that the Jews as a group sought rights as citizens, but that it seems probable that they were successful in their quest for the right to live according to their ancestral laws, and that the transition from Seleucid to Roman rule did not effect any change in their civic status. She notes the loyalty of the Diaspora Jews to Israel, as seen both in the refusal of the Egyptian Jewish soldiers to fight against Alexander Jannaeus and in their loyalty to Hyrcanus II, as well as, reciprocally, in the readiness of Hyrcanus II to intervene on behalf of the Jews of Asia Minor.

KRAABEL (1492e) focusses, in particular, on the powerful Jewish community of Sardis, the material remains of which have recently been excavated. He concludes that there was little or no Jewish syncretism with the deities Sabazios and Hypsistos.

#### 15.18: The Status of the Jews in Cyrene

Supra, p. 340 ad 1494: APPLEBAUM's major work is based largely on epigraphic material. He discusses in detail (pp. 131–138), however, Josephus' remarks (Apion 2. 44, Ant. 12. 7–8, 14. 116) on the establishment of the Jewish settlement in Cyrene, and notes that they produce the clear impression that the first Jewish settlements in Egypt and Libya were of a decidedly military character. On the basis of analogy with contemporaneous situations elsewhere (e.g., Antiochus III's settlement of Jews in Asia [Ant. 12. 147ff.]), he concludes that it is likely that Jews were sent from Egypt to Cyrene as an organized body of military settlers. As to the citizenship status of the Jews, APPLEBAUM (pp. 176–190) asserts that the fourfold division of the Cyrenaean population reported by Strabo shows that in the first century B.C.E. the Jews were not, in a body, citizens. He thus concludes that Augustus granted the Jews as a whole a status intermediate between citizens and metics, and that they saw their political status as equal in rights to that of the citizens. As to the revolt led by the revolutionary Jonathan the Weaver (Life 424, War 7. 437–438), APPLEBAUM sees a contradiction between Josephus' description of Jonathan as a member of the Sicarii and his conduct as a prophet. Jonathan, he says, filled the vacuum in leadership which resulted from the annihilation of the Jewish aristocracy of Cyrenaica in 73.

#### 15.20: Agrippa II and Berenice

(1508d) D. BARAG: The Palestinian Judaea Capta Coins of Vespasian and Titus and the Era on the Coins of Agrippa II Minted under the Flavians. In: Numismatic Chronicle 18, 1978, pp. 14–23.

BARAG (1508d) concludes that coins minted in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of Agrippa II prove that he was still reigning in 95–96, and that therefore both the ‘Antiquities’ and the ‘Life’, in the latter of which he is referred to as dead, were completed after that date. We may comment, however, that there is some doubt as to the date from which Agrippa reckoned his reign, and that the coins seem to indicate that he regarded his reign as beginning in the year 50, and not in 61–62, as BARAG claims.

## 15.22: Nero

(1517a) L. BESSONE: Flavio Giuseppe e la rivolta di Vindice. In: *Giornale filologico ferrarese* 3, 1980, pp. 109–118.

BESSONE (1517a) discounts Josephus’ statement (War 4. 440) that Vespasian in Palestine learned of Vindex’s uprising against Nero in Gaul and declares that Nero’s entourage knew nothing before Vindex officially raised the standard of revolt.

## 16.4: The Causes and Goals of the War

Supra, p. 355 ad 1547j: KRANSEN, in a popular essay based primarily on secondary sources, emphasizes the social and economic background of the uprising against the Romans and stresses that the war was not a sudden eruption but the culmination of factors that had been at work for over a century. He notes that during this period the Sanhedrin had become more and more limited in its scope as a civil and judicial body, so that Josephus even fails to mention it after a while. KRANSEN, however, does not accept Josephus unequivocally, especially with regard to the Zealots.

(1547m) RICHARD A. HORSLEY: Ancient Jewish Banditry and the Revolt against Rome, A. D. 66–70. In: *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43, 1981, pp. 409–432.

(1547n) E. J. HOBBSAWM: *Primitive Rebels*. New York 1965.

HORSLEY (1547m), in seeking to explain the causes of the Jewish revolt, notes that banditry had increased dramatically during the decades that preceded it. Using the pioneer work of HOBBSAWM (1547n), he cites the characteristics of social banditry in present societies as a form of primitive or pre-political rebellion. Once it has become clear from a more precise analysis of Josephus’ account that one cannot legitimately have recourse to a hypothetical resistance movement (the Zealots, as he notes, arose only during the war itself), we can explain it in terms of banditry. With the help of HOBBSAWM, HORSLEY then attempts to illuminate the nature of this banditry under Roman rule, noting, in particular, its extent, the general and special socio-economic conditions surrounding it, the relations between bandits and peasants, its relation to apocalypticism, its role in the revolt in Galilee and in Judea, and its leadership, notably John of Gischala, and how he emerged from its ranks.



## 16.5: Babylonian Jewry and the War

- (1547p) LEA ROTH-GARSON: The Contribution of Josephus Flavius to the Study of the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. In: *A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 31–33.

ROTH-GARSON (1547p) notes the evidence pertaining to the help given by the Babylonian Jews to the revolutionaries during the war of 66–74.

## 16.6: The Progress of the War

Supra, p. 360 ad 1563j: CHRISTIE has a series of popular essays on various sites in Palestine, in one of which (pp. 28–33) he speculates on Cestius Gallus' illogical action. He concludes that Gallus must have met Josephus.

- (1563m) HYAM MACCOBY: *Revolution in Judaea: Jesus and the Jewish Resistance*. New York 1980.
- (1563n) LEA ROTH-GARSON: The Contribution of Flavius Josephus to the Study of the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. In: *A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 31–33.
- (1563o) MORDECHAI GICHON: Cestius Gallus's March on Jerusalem, 66 CE (in Hebrew). In: AHARON OPPENHEIMER, URIEL RAPPAPORT, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Jerusalem 1980. Pp. 283–319. Revised version in English: Cestius Gallus' Campaign in Judaea. In: *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 113, 1981, pp. 39–62.
- (1563p) SHIMON APPLEBAUM: The Question of Josephus' Historical Reliability in the Two Test Cases: – Antipatris of Kefar-Saba and Antipatris of Caesarea. In: *A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 15.
- (1563q) ZEEV SAFRAI: Vespasian's Campaigns of Conquest in Judea (in Hebrew). In: AHARON OPPENHEIMER, URIEL RAPPAPORT, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Jerusalem 1980. Pp. 320–339.

MACCOBY (1563m), pp. 172–175, in a brief summary of the Jewish war against the Romans based upon an uncritical acceptance of Josephus, stresses the cruelty of the Romans in their conquest of Jerusalem.

ROTH-GARSON (1563n) discusses the massacre of the Jewish communities of Syria and of Alexandria and the attempt made by the refugees to reinstitute fighting in Egypt and in Cyrenaica.

GICHON (1563o) concludes that Josephus is reliable in his account of Gallus' campaign (which he looks upon as a typical colonial action intended to suppress a provincial uprising before it developed into a major war), since he was able to observe this part of the war at first-hand, being in Jerusalem at that

time, and since he was not hostile either to Gallus or to the Jewish leaders. Moreover, Josephus had ready access to both the secular and religious leaders of the Jews and to most of the Jewish commanders. In addition, he had first-hand knowledge of the topography, was well versed in military matters, and had an intimate knowledge of the forces and tactics of both sides. Moreover, Josephus had ready access to Roman documents. Finally, Josephus had to be careful in his writing since most of the persons involved were still alive and could presumably refute him if he had falsified any information. GICHON tries to criticize Gallus' campaign from a modern military point of view, though he admits the danger inherent in this approach, concluding that Gallus' basic mistake was to allow himself to be diverted from his primary objective. As to why Gallus retreated, GICHON's conclusion is that he did so because of the imminence of winter and sudden rains. He thus vindicates Josephus in almost all details, though we may ask why Josephus did not give GICHON's reason for Gallus' retreat.

APPLEBAUM (1563p) notes that Josephus has omitted various details connected with Vespasian's operation in 68 against Antipatris, inasmuch as he (Vespasian) was forced to destroy the city and its surrounding villages.

SAFRAI (1563q) notes that in conquering Judea Vespasian and Titus avoided a frontal attack and instead proceeded step by step to close the noose around Jerusalem, starting with the Coastal Plain and moving cautiously ever closer to Jerusalem while avoiding the mistakes of Cestius Gallus.

## 16.8: The Burning of the Temple

(1594c) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Destruction of Jerusalem (in Hebrew). In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, ed., *The Book of Jerusalem: Jerusalem, its Natural Conditions, History and Development from the Origins to the Present Day*, vol. 1: *The Natural Conditions and the History of the City from its Origins to the Destruction of the Second Temple*. Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv 1956. Pp. 252–263.

SCHALIT (1594c), in briefly summarizing the history of the Roman siege of Jerusalem, expresses suspicion of Josephus' account of the burning of the Temple and prefers that of Sulpicius Severus as being based certainly on a lost portion of Tacitus. He is also incredulous of Josephus' statement that the total of those who died in Jerusalem was 1,100,000, since the defenders were fewer than half of the number of Romans who besieged the city and since the number of captives was only 97,000.

## 16.10: Military Aspects of the War and in Josephus in General

Supra, p. 371 ad 1605e: WEBSTER cites Josephus uncritically; he notes that the most outstanding remains of marching camps are at Masada.

## 16.11: Vespasian and Titus

Supra, p. 373 ad 1618: Or, we may suggest, it may be that Josephus, a religious Jew, did not want to have it appear that Vespasian, a pagan, was able to effect cures by apparent divine aid.

- (1619a) LEA ROTH-GARSON: The Contribution of Josephus Flavius to the Study of the Jewish Diaspora in the Hellenistic-Roman Period. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 31–33.

ROTH-GARSON (1619a) discusses the poll-tax levied on world Jewry after the war.

Supra, p. 375 ad 1620g: BENGTON, pp. 36–44, 69–78, and 80–82, drawing primarily on Josephus, presents a brief summary of Vespasian's campaign against the Jews and of his rise to the throne.

- (1620h) JOHN NICOLS: Vespasian and the Partes Flavianae. Wiesbaden 1978.

- (1620i) GLEN W. BOWERSOCK: Syria under Vespasian. In: Journal of Roman Studies 63, 1973, pp. 133–140.

NICOLS (1620h), pp. 48–57, who usually follows Josephus uncritically, argues that Josephus found the dates for military events in the 'Commentarii' of Vespasian. In discussing, pp. 62–63, Vespasian's elevation to the throne and Vespasian's second campaign, however, he suggests that Josephus deliberately altered the facts in order to bring the 'War' into line with Flavian propaganda.

BOWERSOCK (1620i) remarks that Vespasian's familiarity with Palestine and with the surrounding region provided the basis for a well-informed policy with regard to the whole area.

## 16.13: Domitian

Supra, p. 377 ad 1628d: APPLEBAUM, the English translation of whose essay contains some modifications and additions, asserts that it is tempting to identify with Josephus' patron, Epaphroditus, Nero's *a rationibus*, who was a *libellis* under Domitian, the more so since Epictetus, who possessed some knowledge of Judaism, was a member of his household.

## 17.0: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: the 'War'

- (1635h) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Josephus Flavius: A Biographical Essay. In his: The Rise and Fall of the Judaean State. Vol. 3: 66 C.E. – 120 C.E. Philadelphia 1978. Pp. 385–417.

- (1635i) MAGEN BROSHI: The Credibility of Josephus. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 20.

ZEITLIN (1635h) concludes that the facts in Josephus' 'War' are credible but that his interpretations are highly subjective. Nevertheless, he asserts that the work is well qualified stylistically to stand comparison with the great works of the Greek and Roman historiographical tradition.

BROSHI (1635i) postulates that Josephus' sources for details, such as the description of Masada, were the *hypomnemata* ('Commentarii') of Vespasian and Titus (Life 342, 358; Against Apion 1.56). From the absence of any reference to these military reports in the 'War' most scholars have been led to believe that they served Josephus only in his later works; but, says BROSHI, the archaeological data show that they were consulted by Josephus while he was writing the 'War' as well.

### 17.1: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: the 'Life'

(1646c) E. MIGLIARIO: Per l'interpretazione dell'Autobiografia di Flavio Giuseppe. In: *Athenaeum* 59, 1981, pp. 92–137.

MIGLIARIO (1646c) views the 'Life' as an apologetic work in answer to Justus of Tiberias in the particular historical situation created in the Diaspora at the end of the first century C.E. in view of the need for peaceful co-existence with Rome.

### 17.2: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: 'Against Apion'

(1647) JAMES E. CROUCH: The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel (*Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, 109). Diss., Tübingen. Publ.: Göttingen 1972.

(1647j) ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge 1975.

(1647k) P. W. VAN DER HORST: Chaeremon, Egyptisch priester en antisemitisch Stoicijn uit de tijd van het Nieuwe Testament. In: *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 35, 1981, pp. 265–272.

CROUCH (1647), pp. 82–83, demonstrates that Josephus (Against Apion 2. 190–210) uses the traditional Stoic scheme of the κατῆκον (what is proper) in his summary of the laws, namely G-d, the Temple, marriage, children, the dead, parents, friends, and aliens, in the order traditional in Hellenistic Stoic literature.

MOMIGLIANO (1647j), pp. 76–82, notes that Josephus made a diligent search in Greek literature for references to the Jews when he compiled his work 'Against Apion' but that the results were negligible, and that modern scholars have had no better luck. MOMIGLIANO then speculates as to why the Greeks and the Jews did not have more cultural contact, and concludes that the chief reasons were that the Jews deliberately sought to isolate themselves and that the Greeks sought so often to disturb the peace of the Persian Empire on which the reconstruction of Judaism depended. We may suggest that the Greeks

probably ignored the Jews because they disdained the latter's apparent anti-intellectualism, as seen in the character of the great heroes of Judaism from Moses on down in the Bible.

I have not seen VAN DER HORST (1647k), who deals with the anti-Semite Chaeremon (Against Apion 1. 288–292).

### 18.1: Herodotus and Thucydides

(1671da) SVEN EK: Herodotismen in der jüdischen Archäologie des Josephos und ihre textkritische Bedeutung. In: *Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-samfundet i Lund. Acta Regiae Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis* 2, Lund 1945–46, pp. 27–62, 213.

EK (1671da) notes numerous instances throughout the 'Antiquities' where Josephus has been influenced by Herodotus in language.

### 18.4: Clearchus of Soli and Hermippus of Smyrna

(1676b) MENAHEM LUZ: Clearchus of Soli as a Source of Eleazar's Deuterosis. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 12–13.

LUZ (1676b), noting parallels between Eleazar ben Jair's second speech at Masada (War 7. 341–388) and Clearchus of Soli, concludes that since the majority of the literary and philosophical analogies belong to the Hellenistic world generally, it is likely that Josephus used contemporary literature which dealt with death in accordance with Clearchus' arguments.

### 18.14: Dionysius of Halicarnassus

Supra, p. 408 ad 1726a (LADOUCEUR): As to the formula "Let each man judge for himself", this concept is also found in Herodotus (2. 123 and 3. 122) and Thucydides (6. 2. 1). Moreover, there are important differences between Josephus and Dionysius in the contexts of the passages containing the formula, since Dionysius remains neutral, whereas Josephus states unmistakably what he believes. We may, however, comment that the very fact that Josephus concludes with the formula shows all the more his dependence. As to the fact that both Josephus and Dionysius use ἑδωκεν for the reflexive pronoun, the same usage is found more than sixty times in Polybius, as well as in the Septuagint, the New Testament, inscriptions, and papyri. Similarly, not only Josephus and Dionysius use compound verbs with two prepositions prefixed and compounds of words common in classical Greek in uncompounded form, but Polybius, the Septuagint, and the papyri do likewise. Finally, when there exist variable declensional and

conjugational forms, Dionysius tends to follow Attic usage more strictly, while Josephus fluctuates more freely between classical and post-classical usage.

- (1726b) F. GERALD DOWNING: Redaction Criticism: Josephus' *Antiquities* and the Synoptic Gospels. In: *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 8, 1980, pp. 45–65; 9, 1980, pp. 29–48.
- (1726c) F. GERALD DOWNING: Ethical Pagan Theism and the Speeches in Acts. In: *New Testament Studies* 27, 1981, pp. 544–563.
- (1726d) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: The Language of Josephus. To be published in: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 1982.

DOWNING (1726b) notes thematic parallels between Josephus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus in the stress on repentance, on G-d as an ally, in enhancement of the operation of Providence, in religion as a social bond, in the value of common institutions, in the concept of natural duties, in respect for divine and human authority, in the notion that aristocracy is best, in the importance of boundary stones, and in the significance of private contracts. We may comment that some of these parallels are commonplace, and that some result from the similarity between Roman and Jewish law and institutions.

DOWNING (1726c), in comparing the speeches of Acts with those in Josephus and in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, concludes that Josephus' criteria for selection and his mode of presentation are determined by what his Hellenistic readers might recognize and receive sympathetically, and that one very clear source is Dionysius. He notes close parallels between Josephus and Dionysius in their views of the attributes of G-d and in their ethical theory, but, we may suggest, these tend, rather, to be commonplaces in an essentially religious society.

LADOUCEUR (1726d) presents some of the major points of his dissertation (1726a).

### 18.17: Philo

- (1735a) EARLE HILGERT: A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1972–1973. In: *Studia Philonica* 3, 1974–75, pp. 117–125.
- (1735b) EARLE HILGERT: A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1974–1975. In: *Studia Philonica* 4, 1976–77, pp. 79–85.
- (1735c) EARLE HILGERT: A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1976–1977. In: *Studia Philonica* 5, 1978, pp. 113–120.
- (1735d) EARLE HILGERT: A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1978. In: *Studia Philonica* 6, 1979–80, pp. 197–200.
- (1771n) THOMAS W. FRANKMAN: The Literary and Exegetical Treatment of Genesis in the *Jewish Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus in the Light of Pseudepigrapha, Targumim, and Midrashic Sources. Diss., Oxford 1975. Published as: *Genesis and the 'Jewish Antiquities' of Flavius Josephus* (*Biblica et Orientalia*, 35). Rome 1979.
- (1771o) MAX KÜCHLER: Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen: Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahwesglaubens (*Orbis biblicus et orientalis*, 26). Freiburg and Göttingen 1979.

FRANKMAN's (1771n) success in finding parallels in so many points between Josephus' account and that of Philo is the most systematic indication that has

thus far been compiled to support the view that Josephus did, indeed, use Philo's Biblical exposition.

KÜCHLER (1771o) presents, though with little independent analysis, Josephus' summary of the Law (Apion 2. 190–219) in parallel columns with Philo's 'Hypothetica' and Pseudo-Phocylides. He remarks that the relative closeness of Josephus to the Law contrasts with the distance from the Law exhibited by Philo (Hypothetica 7. 1–9) and by Pseudo-Phocylides, who veered closer to Hellenistic wisdom learning.

### 19.1: G-d

(1803mf) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: The Concept of G-d in the Works of Flavius Josephus. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31, 1980, pp. 171–189.

SHUTT (1803mf) remarks that usually Josephus employs the article with θεός; and that when he omits it he does so for the sake of emphasis, nuance, or euphony. As to τὸ θεῖον, its meaning is usually "the Deity", without any necessary reference to the G-d of Israel. Sometimes, however, Josephus uses Stoic language about G-d; and hence, says SHUTT, he would, in modern terms, be called a liberal Jew. We may comment that inasmuch as Judaism places relatively less stress upon creed and more upon deed, and inasmuch as we have no reason to doubt Josephus' statements about his meticulousness in observance of the commandments, we could hardly term Josephus a "liberal" Jew; at best we would call him a "modern" Orthodox Jew.

### 19.6: The Soul

(1808c) HANS C. C. CAVALLIN: Leben nach dem Tode im Spätjudentum. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 2. 19. 1, Berlin 1979, pp. 240–345. [See supra, p. 430.]

### 19.7: Fate and Free Will

(1818ea) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: The Concept of G-d in the Works of Flavius Josephus. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31, 1980, pp. 171–189.

(1818eb) LUTHER H. MARTIN: Josephus' Use of *Heimarmene* in the *Jewish Antiquities* XIII. 171–3. In: *Numen* 28, 1981, pp. 127–137.

SHUTT (1818ea) asserts that what the Greeks would understand by the idea of Fate and the Romans by the concept of Fortune Josephus approximates with the conception of G-d. However, in recounting events closer to his own time he introduces Fortune, which he then links with Fate, rather than linking Fate with G-d.

MARTIN (1818eb) suggests that Josephus' use of εἰμαρμένη was influenced by its use in Hellenistic popular astrology (cf. *Corpus Hermeticum*, *Poimandres*

1.9), though admittedly he never employs it in this technical sense. This suggestion, we may remark, is particularly appealing in view of the fact that Josephus highlights Abraham's knowledge of astrology in his version of the Biblical narrative (Ant. 1. 156, 167) and of the fact that he finds astrological significance in his interpretation of the tabernacle and of the vestments of the high priest.

### 19.8: Suffering

- (1818g) SAM K. WILLIAMS: Jesus' Death as Saving Event. Diss., Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. 1972. Publ. (Harvard Dissertations in Religion, 2): Missoula, Montana 1975.  
 (1818h) EDUARD LOHSE: Märtyrer und Gottesknecht. Göttingen 1955.

WILLIAMS (1818g), pp. 75–76, discusses Josephus' remarks on the Righteous Ones who suffered under Antiochus Epiphanes and, in particular (pp. 125–126), the concept of vicarious expiatory suffering and death in Josephus. He disagrees with LOHSE (1818h), who says that Josephus (War 5. 419) refers to vicarious atonement, since the phrase *μισθὸν τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας τὸ ἔμὸν αἷμα* has nothing to do with sin and expiation but rather refers to the avoidance of total destruction by the Romans, though he admits that the phrase does imply that the death of an individual can have beneficial effects for others.

### 19.13: The Description of the Temple

- (1857o) DAVID M. JACOBSON: Ideas concerning the Plan of Herod's Temple. In: Palestine Exploration Quarterly 112, 1980, pp. 33–40.  
 (1857p) TH. A. BUSINK: Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes. Eine archäologisch-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus. Vol. 2: Von Ezechiel bis Middelton. Leiden 1980. Pp. 701–1611.  
 (1857q) YITZHAK MAGEN: The Gates of the Temple Mount according to Josephus and the Tractate Middoth (in Hebrew). In: Cathedra 14, 1980, pp. 41–53.  
 (1857r) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, ed., The Book of Jerusalem: Jerusalem, its Natural Conditions, History and Development from the Origins to the Present Day, vol. 1: The Natural Conditions and the History of the City from its Origins to the Destruction of the Second Temple. Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv 1956. Pp. 392–418.

JACOBSON (1857o) relies primarily on the Mishnah and only secondarily on Josephus in drawing a plan of the Temple outwards from the altar. He follows Josephus (War 5. 238, 245) in noting that the Antonia jutted into the northwestern corner of the *temenos*, coming between the northern and western colonnades.

BUSINK (1857p), pp. 1063–1068, discusses Josephus' description of the second court of the Temple (War 5. 193–195). He explains the meaning of *ὁ ἐντὸς περιβολος* (Ant. 15. 417) as referring to the wall around the sanctuary which stood on the podium, and suggests that instead of reading this inner



enclosure one should read the inner enclosure. He notes that 'Against Apion' does not mention either the second court or the warning tablets and explains this by remarking that 'Against Apion' and the 'Antiquities' were written for different purposes. BUSINK exhaustively discusses (pp. 1105 ff.) Josephus' description (War 5. 207–224, Ant. 15. 391–395) of the Temple buildings. He concludes definitively that in reconstructing the Temple one should use Josephus rather than 'Middoth'.

MAGEN (1857q), on the basis of archaeological remains, explains the differences between Josephus' (Ant. 15. 410–411) account of the gates of the Temple Mount and that of the Mishnah in 'Middoth' by postulating that each reflects a different period, the Mishnah before and Josephus after Herod.

AVI-YONAH (1857r) argues that while it is true that Josephus doubtless served as a priest in the Temple, still he wrote his work for strangers, who were in no position to check up on him. He tried thus to increase the glory of the Temple and exaggerated numbers, whereas the Mishnah's description, which is not directed toward non-Jews, is more credible, even though it has disputes within it.

### 19.15: The Half-Shekel Tax of the Temple and Other Donations

(1866j) LEA ROTH-GARSON: The Civil and Religious Status of the Jews in Asia Minor from Alexander the Great to Constantine, B.C. 336–A.D. 337 (in Hebrew), Diss., Hebrew University, Jerusalem 1972.

(1866k) A. CARLEBACH: Rabbinic References to *Fiscus Judaicus*. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 66, 1975–76, pp. 57–61.

(1866l) VICTOR A. TCHERIKOVER and ALEXANDER FUKS, edd.: Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum, vol. 2. Cambridge, Mass. 1960.

ROTH-GARSON (1866j) comments on the relationship of the Diaspora Jews to the land of Israel, particularly as seen in the payment of the half-shekel.

CARLEBACH (1866k) notes that the main source for the humiliating *Fiscus Judaicus*, which the Romans imposed in place of the half-shekel tax, is Josephus (War 7. 218). Josephus, however, says that the tax was two drachmas, whereas the Mekhilta Ba-ḥodesh 1 says that it was fifteen shekels. CARLEBACH explains the discrepancy by postulating that the Romans, knowing that some Jews paid as much as a golden daric as their Temple tax, demanded at least as much. We may also call attention to Josephus' statement (Ant. 18. 312) that in Nisibis in Babylonia the Jews deposited their two-drachma coins, "as well as any other dedicatory offerings." Hence, we may explain the fifteen shekels as representing general donations to the Temple. We may also note that in the ostraka from Apollinopolis Magna (Edfu), as edited by TCHERIKOVER and FUKS (1866l), nos. 204–229 (pp. 130–136), as well as in the Arsinoe papyrus (no 421, pp. 204–208), we find that the amounts paid for the 'Jewish tax' during the reign of Trajan ranged from one drachma and two obols to nine drachmas and two obols, though one may explain the variations as merely indicating installments toward the full tax of eight drachmas, which was the Egyptian equivalent of two denarii

plus two obols, because the fee was paid in local money, plus one drachma for the tax for 'first-fruits', as TCHERIKOVER, pp. 114–115, explains it. Hence, we may explain the large amount of gold which the Jews of Asia Minor sent to the Temple (Cicero, *Pro Flacco* 28. 67–69) as representing general contributions to the Temple, and not merely the half-shekel tax.

### 19.16: Excavations of the Temple Area

(1869e) BENJAMIN MAZAR: Excavations Near Temple Mount Reveal Splendors of Herodian Jerusalem. In: *Biblical Archaeology Review* 6. 4, July–August 1980, pp. 44–59.

MAZAR (1869e), in a brief report of the excavations conducted in 1976–77 south and west of the Temple, concludes that the city thus revealed confirms in almost every detail the description in Josephus. In particular, MAZAR has found confirmation of the inscription (War 4. 582) "to the place of the trumpeting," announcing the arrival and departure of the Sabbath. Moreover, in confirmation of Josephus (Ant. 15. 410), the so-called Robinson's Arch supported not a bridge but a monumental stairway which led from the Temple Mount into the Tyropoeon Valley.

### 19.21: The Sanhedrin

(1948i) ELLIS RIVKIN: Beth Din, Boulé Sanhedrin: A Tragedy of Errors. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 46, 1975, pp. 181–199.

RIVKIN (1948i) concludes that in Josephus the term Sanhedrin is used as a highly generalized term referring to a council convened by a ruler or by one in authority to carry through some political purpose. He cites Josephus' account of the trial of James (Ant. 20. 197–203) and of the request of the Levites to have the king convene a Sanhedrin (Ant. 20. 216–218) in support of his statement that it is always to be translated with an indefinite article unless it has been assigned a specific function, and that the function was political, not religious. We may, however, note that in the case of James the charge against him was religious, namely transgressing the Law, and that in the case of the Levites it was for a religious purpose, namely to grant permission to the Levites to wear linen robes on equal terms with the priests, that a Sanhedrin was convened.

### 19.22: Rabbinic Sages: Onias (Honi) and Pollio (Abtalion)

(1951b) OTTO BETZ: The Death of Choni-Onias in the Light of the Temple Scroll from Qumran (Notes to Antiquities 14. 22–24) (in Hebrew). In: AHARON OPPENHEIMER, URIEL RAPPAPORT, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Jerusalem 1980. Pp. 84–97.

BETZ (1951b) asserts that Josephus' account of the death of Onias (Ant. 14. 22–24) is in accord with the Mishnah (Ta'anith 3. 8). The Temple Scroll (11 Q

Miqdash 64. 6–13) similarly condemns the uttering of a curse upon the Jews as blasphemy.

### 19.24: False Prophets

(1984w) P. W. BARNETT: *The Jewish Eschatological Prophets A.D. 40–70 in Their Theological and Political Setting*. Diss., University of London, 1977.

(1984x) P. W. BARNETT: *The Jewish Sign Prophets – A.D. 40–70 – Their Intentions and Origin*. In: *New Testament Studies* 27, 1981, pp. 679–697.

I have not seen BARNETT (1984w).

BARNETT (1984x) says that the prophets mentioned by Josephus in the period preceding the Jewish war against the Romans should be regarded not as revolutionaries or messiahs or pious charismatics but as ‘sign prophets’ who followed the pattern of the leaders of the exodus and of the conquest of the land of Israel. Thus, for example, Theudas’ (Ant. 20. 97–99) claim that at his command the Jordan River would be parted is clearly a reference to Moses’ division of the Red Sea and/or Joshua’s division of the Jordan. He suggests that Jesus was of this type and may, indeed, have been a causal factor in the rise of these sign prophets. BARNETT, however, admits that the Egyptian prophet (War 2. 261–263 and Ant. 20. 168–172) also presents himself as a king. Jesus, similarly, we may note, was apparently regarded as a political leader by the Roman authorities, to judge from the inscription on the cross.

### 19.26: Josephus’ Philosophy of History

(2004b) BERNARD THÉRON: *Le discours de l’histoire dans “La guerre des Juifs” de Flavius Josèphe*. Diss., University of Paris 1979.

THÉRON (2004b) concludes that Josephus, far from being a laborious compiler, was a philosopher or, more precisely, a theologian of history, particularly as seen in the style of the ‘War’.

### 19.27: Josephus’ Political Theory

(2009aa) LUCIO TROIANI: *Gli Ebraei e lo stato pagano in Filone e in Giuseppe*. In: *Ricerche di storiografia antica* 2, 1980, pp. 193–218.

TROIANI (2009aa) stresses that Josephus’ aim, especially in citing decrees in his ‘Antiquities’ (see especially his comment in Ant. 16. 171), was to restore the spirit of co-existence between the Jews and the Romans after the revolution of 66–74. He is thus eager to show that high Roman functionaries, such as Petronius, were ardent admirers of the Jews (cf., e.g., Ant. 18. 282). This aim was facilitated by the successful proselyting movement conducted by Jews. And yet, Josephus did not seek by this reconciliation to promote assimilation of Judaism

to Greco-Roman civilization. We may comment that the proselyting movement hardly aided this aim, since it aroused much antagonism both in Roman political circles (as witness the antagonism toward it on the part of Domitian) and in intellectual circles, as seen in the bitter remarks of Tacitus (Hist. 5. 5) and Juvenal (14. 96–106), at the very time that Josephus was writing his ‘Antiquities’.

### 19.30: Josephus’ Attitude toward the Land of Israel

Supra, p. 483 ad 2012a: SOLOMON cites Josephus often to substantiate his thesis that there was considerable interchange culturally and religiously between Israel and the Diaspora during the period of the Second Temple. If so, however, we may ask, why is there no direct evidence of the study of the Bible or of the Oral Torah in Hebrew outside of Palestine?

(2012b) BETSY H. AMARU: Land Theology in Josephus’ *Jewish Antiquities*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 71, 1980–81, pp. 201–229.

AMARU (2012b) notes that in his paraphrase of the Bible Josephus deliberately omits the stress on the covenanted land of Israel, since this was the focal point of the revolutionaries in his own day, and instead shifts to the promise of a great Jewish population and a Jewish Diaspora. She notes, for example, that in the Biblical account of Abraham the stress is on the covenanted land, whereas in Josephus the central focus is Abraham. Elsewhere also he sets land acquisition in the tone of predictions of providential assistance rather than as a promise of divine gift. She notes that none of the mystical and poetic descriptions of the land are picked up by Josephus. We may comment that to some degree, at least, the shift in Josephus may be due to the fact that he is primarily a historian and hence focusses on Abraham, for example, as a historical figure, rather than on theological issues.

### 19.32: The Messiah and Eschatology in General

(2022 n) DAVID HILL: Jesus and Josephus’ ‘Messianic Prophets’. In: ERNEST BEST and R. McL. WILSON, edd., *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black*. Cambridge 1979. Pp. 143–154.

HILL (2022 n) remarks that Theudas (Ant. 20. 97–98) and the Egyptian prophet (War 2. 261, Ant. 20. 169) could make their claims of prophecy only within the context of events heralding the Messianic times when the prophetic spirit was expected to be active again.

### 19.33: The Messianic Background of the Jewish Revolt

(2031a) F. LUCREZI: Un’ambigua profezia in Flavio Giuseppe. In: *Atti della Accademia di Scienze morali e politiche della Società nazionale di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti di Napoli* 90, 1979, pp. 589–631.

- (2031b) DEAN CHARLES KALLANDER: *The Defense of Jerusalem in the Roman Siege of 70 C.E.: A Study of First Century Apocalyptic Ideas*. Diss., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 1980 (summary in *Dissertation Abstracts International* 41, no. 11, p. 4797–A).

LUCREZI (2031a) argues that the ambiguous oracle (War 6. 312–313) was invented by Josephus to counteract the Jewish Messianism which the priesthood, to which he belonged, so bitterly opposed. We may comment, however, that inasmuch as a similar oracle is found in Suetonius (Vespasian 5. 6) and Tacitus (Histories 5. 13), its authenticity is likely. There is, moreover, no evidence in the Talmud that the priests were as a class opposed to Messianism.

I have not seen KALLANDER (2031b), who, according to the summary in *Dissertation Abstracts*, concludes that apocalyptic eschatological beliefs held by both Jews and Christians in Palestine in the first century C.E. played a significant role in the Jewish War. He finds in Josephus' account a basis for believing that the eschatological expectations were, in part, the source of the internecine conflict among the various groups of Jews.

## 20.0: Josephus' Attitude toward Halakhah (Jewish Law): General

Supra, p. 495 ad 2048: ALTSHULER concludes that Josephus in his phrase consistently demonstrates apologetic tendencies. In this he has been convincingly challenged by GOLDENBERG (2048j, supra, p. 496), pp. 219–235, who notes that in many instances Josephus omits 'cultic-exclusive' subjects simply because he has dealt with them elsewhere, and that in other cases his paraphrases are paralleled by Tannaitic halakhah.

- (2048p) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus Flavius: A Biographical Essay*. In his: *The Rise and Fall of the Judean State: Vol. 3: 66 C.E.–120 C.E.* Philadelphia 1978. Pp. 385–417.
- (2048q) MAX KÜCHLER: *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen: Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens* (*Orbis biblicus et orientalis*, 26). Freiburg and Göttingen 1979.
- (2048r) F. GERALD DOWNING: *Redaction Criticism: Josephus' Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels*. In: *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 8, 1980, pp. 46–65; 9, 1980, pp. 29–48.

ZEITLIN (2048p) cites examples of Josephus' familiarity with Jewish Halakhah of his day.

KÜCHLER (2048q), in discussing Josephus' summary (Apion 2. 190–219) of Jewish law, concludes that he made non-Biblical additions, often from Greek sources, for apologetic reasons.

DOWNING (2048r), commenting on Josephus' rearrangement of the Jewish constitution in the fourth book of the 'Antiquities', notes that at only one point (Ant. 4. 273) has Josephus altered a law, with regard to the freeing of slaves in a Jubilee year (we may however, comment that there are a number of such changes).

## 20.1: Courts, Witnesses, and Punishments

Supra, p. 500 ad 2054e: FRANSEN cites, without comment, War 2.306 and 5.449, and Antiquities 11.17, 11.103, 12.256, 13.380, and 13.410, and Life 420 to stress the horror of crucifixion.

## 20.6: Festivals

(2071a) ABRAHAM P. BLOCH: *The Biblical and Historical Background of the Jewish Holy Days*. New York 1978.

BLOCH (2071a) cites Josephus many times, often critically, in connection with the history of the various holidays in the Jewish calendar. He, p. 14, is, however, wrong in stating that Philo and Josephus did not regard the first of Tishri as a New Year.

BLOCH, pp. 60–61, says that the most significant difference between Josephus and I Maccabees in their version of the story of Hanukkah is in the time of the lighting of the menorah, since I Maccabees 4.50 implies that it was lit on the evening of Kislev 24, whereas Josephus (Ant. 12.319) says that it was on Kislev 25. He says that the time of the lighting of the menorah was immaterial to Josephus, inasmuch as to him the chief point commemorated by the holiday was the restoration of the sacrifices in the Temple. We may, however, comment that Kislev 25 starts on the previous evening; and I Maccabees 4.52 states that the sacrifices took place in the morning, implying that the menorah was lit on the previous day, quite possibly in the evening, that is, when Kislev 25 commenced. Moreover, the fact that Josephus (Ant. 12.325) calls the holiday ‘Lights’ probably indicates, though admittedly he does not state this explicitly, that the lighting of a menorah was crucial in Josephus’ eyes.

BLOCH, p. 112, says that Josephus (Ant. 2.317) errs when he says that the Festival of Unleavened Bread is kept in memory of the time of scarcity which the Israelites underwent after they left Egypt. We may, however, comment that the facts that the matzo is referred to as the “bread of affliction” in rabbinic texts and that “enriched” matzo is forbidden to be eaten on the holiday except by the aged or the sick are, indeed, reminiscent of this scarcity.

Supra, p. 509 ad 2074d: SAFRAI concludes that the numbers who went to Jerusalem for the pilgrimage festivals are exaggerated in the Talmud and even in Josephus, though the numbers that the latter gives are smaller. Citing the fact that Cestius Gallus found certain Jewish towns nearly full of inhabitants at the time of Tabernacles, he concludes that only a small proportion of the Palestinian Jews, and a still smaller proportion of Diaspora Jews, went up to Jerusalem.

(2074j) RANIERO CANTALAMESSA, ed.: *La Pâque dans l’Eglise ancienne*. Trans. by FRANÇOIS MORARD (Traditio Christiana, 4). Berne 1980.

CANTALAMESSA (2074j), p. 8, gives the text, translation into French, and very brief notes on Antiquities 2. 312–313, pertaining to Passover; but he has missed many passages, especially Antiquities 3. 248–251.

## 20.9: Athletics

- (2093j) ROGER R. CHAMBERS: Greek Athletics and the Jews: 165 B.C.–A.D. 70. Diss., Miami University, Oxford, Ohio 1980 (summary in Dissertation Abstracts International 41, no. 4, p. 1711–A).

I have not seen CHAMBERS (2093j), who, according to the summary in Dissertation Abstracts, notes Josephus' comments that Greek sports offended long-standing Jewish sensibilities and, on the contrary, Paul's use of explicit athletic metaphors, as well as archaeological evidence showing the presence of pre-Herodian and Herodian athletic buildings occupied by Jews in Palestine. He consequently concludes that there was an accommodation to Greek athletics by Jews at two levels: positive assimilation and selective acceptance.

## 20.12: Law of Persons: Slavery, Charity, Marriage, Abortion, Divorce

- (2107g) ALFREDO MORDECHAI RABELLO: Divorce in Josephus. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 29–30.

RABELLO (2107g) analyzes two divorce cases in Josephus. In the first, that of Salome, it is the wife who instigates the divorce, but Josephus (Ant. 15. 259–260) specifically notes that she had violated the Jewish tradition and clearly was influenced by the pagan environment. In the second, that of Herodias, Josephus likewise (Ant. 18. 136) remarks that this was contrary to Jewish tradition. In two other passages (Life 414–415, 426–428), where some scholars have sought to show that Josephus departed from the tradition as codified in the Talmud, RABELLO demurs and concludes that Josephus followed the Pharisaic norm.

## 20.13: Theft, Kidnapping, Agency

- (2116d) BERNARD S. JACKSON: Foreign Influence in the Early Jewish Law of Theft. In: *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité* 18, 1971, pp. 25–42. Rpt. in his: *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History* (Studies in Judaism in late Antiquity, 10). Leiden 1975, Pp. 235–249.

JACKSON (2116d), commenting on Herod's decree (Ant. 16. 1–5) establishing an anti-traditional penalty, namely sale to foreign masters and banishment from Judea, disagrees with SCHALIT (2113), who had tried to link the decree with early Roman procedure, since Herod did not enact enslavement to the

victim, nor did he limit it to the offender caught in the act. SCHALIT also suggests that the penalty is based on Digest 47. 17. 1, which imposes hard labor in the mines or *relegatio* for housebreakers; but JACKSON replies that this suggestion of foreign influence is very doubtful, since it is far from certain that the provision in the Digest applied in Herod's day, inasmuch as *relegatio* does not imply sale to a private owner, and, most important of all, because Herod's decree stands outside the mainstream of Jewish law. The best explanation, as JACKSON points out, is to say that Herod simply extended the traditional law. A particularly strong argument is that if, indeed, Josephus had been aware that Herod's decree was based on Roman law, he would hardly have condemned it as he does.

## 21.0: Religious Movements: The Samaritans: Josephus as a Source

(2139p) FERDINAND DEXINGER: Die Sektenproblematik im Judentum. In: Kairos 21, 1979, pp. 273–287.

DEXINGER (2139p) remarks that since Josephus no more than reflects the current Jewish prejudices of his day, we cannot tell how much earlier than Josephus the tradition of interpretation identifying the Samaritans and the Cuthaeans went. It may be, he suggests, that it was comparatively recent in his time.

## 21.3: Events in the History of the Samaritans

(2170j) JOHN J. COLLINS: The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans. In: Harvard Theological Review 73, 1980, pp. 91–104.

COLLINS (2170j) notes that Josephus (Ant. 11. 340–347 and 12. 257–264) very explicitly equates the Sidonians with the Samaritans. Some scholars have thought that the letter to Antiochus Epiphanes (Ant. 12. 258–261) was sent by an actual colony of Sidonians at Shechem; but, says COLLINS, the fact that the Sidonians in question make a petition about the temple on Mount Gerizim supports the view that they were simply Samaritans. COLLINS also comments on the Hellenization of the Samaritans, as indicated in this letter. As to the destruction of Shechem, he concludes, on the basis of archaeological evidence, that it took place some years after its capture as noted by Josephus.

## 22.0: The Jewish Sects: General

Supra, p. 549 ad 2210p: FLUSSER stresses that Josephus portrays the three sects as three philosophic groups and notes how much new light has been cast upon Josephus' description by the Dead Sea Scrolls.



- (2210u) CLEMENS THOMA: *Christliche Theologie des Judentums*. Aschaffenburg 1978.
- (2210v) FERDINAND DEXINGER: *Die Sektenproblematik im Judentum*. In: *Kairos* 21, 1979, pp. 273–287.
- (2210w) NEIL J. MCELENEY: *Orthodoxy in Judaism of the First Christian Century*. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 4, 1973, pp. 19–42.
- (2210x) MICHAEL E. STONE: *Scriptures, Sects and Visions. A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts*. Philadelphia 1980.
- (2210y) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *The Religious and Cultural Life of Jerusalem in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew)*. In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, ed., *The Book of Jerusalem: Jerusalem, its Natural Conditions, History and Development from the Origins to the Present Day*, vol. 1: *The Natural Conditions and the History of the City from its Origins to the Destruction of the Second Temple*. Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv 1956. Pp. 264–304.

THOMA (2210u), pp. 62–107, has a popular survey of Jewish groups during the Hellenistic period.

DEXINGER (2210v), in a response to MCELENEY (2210w), concludes that sects arose primarily because of cultural, political, and ethnic differences, and not because of theological disputes. The fact that Judaism is usually tolerant of difference of opinion meant that the development of these sects took place over a long period of time.

STONE (2210x), pp. 68–74, has a popular survey of the views of the four sects.

KLAUSNER (2210y), pp. 300–304, discusses the sects, especially the Essenes, who, he says, established the first Socialist Utopia.

## 22.1: The Views of the Sects: Fate and Prophecy

- (2216d) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *The Concept of G-d in the Works of Flavius Josephus*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31, 1980, pp. 171–189.

SHUTT (2216d), pp. 183–185, notes that in both the ‘War’ and the ‘Antiquities’ Josephus himself declares that Fate was somehow operative in human affairs, and that in the ‘War’ and in the earlier part of the ‘Antiquities’ he links it with G-d, but that as he approaches his own period he introduces Fortune, which he links with Fate, rather than linking Fate with G-d. He does so, says SHUTT, in order to make his narrative intelligible to non-Jewish readers, who regarded *Fortuna Romana* as favoring the Roman Empire. We may comment that inasmuch as the entire ‘Antiquities’ was especially intended for a non-Jewish audience and inasmuch as it was especially important, as we can see from Josephus’ reworking of the Bible, to make the Biblical period of Jewish history palatable for these readers, we would expect that he would be particularly concerned with this goal in his version of the Biblical period, where, to judge from comments from anti-Semites, there was much misunderstanding and misrepresentation of Jewish history.

## 22.2: The Pharisees: General

Supra, p. 559 ad 2242r: KELLY employs Josephus as a corrective to the Gospels, which, she says, use the type of accusation against the Pharisees typical of polemic. In particular, she examines the polemic in Matthew 23. 13–36 against the Pharisees.

- (2242zc) JACOB NEUSNER: Die Verwendung des späteren rabbinischen Materials für die Erforschung des Pharisäismus im 1. Jahrhundert n. Chr. In: Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche 76, 1979, pp. 292–309.
- (2242zd) HYAM MACCOBY: Revolution in Judaea: Jesus and the Jewish Resistance. New York 1980.
- (2242ze) M. SILVA: The Pharisees in Modern Jewish Scholarship: A Review Article. In: Westminster Theological Journal 42, 1980, pp. 395–405.
- (2242zf) ALEXANDER GUTTMANN: Rabbinic Judaism in the Making: A Chapter in the History of the Halakhah from Ezra to Judah I. Detroit 1970.
- (2242zg) JACOB NEUSNER: The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70. 3 vols. Leiden 1971.
- (2242zh) JACOB NEUSNER: From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1973.

NEUSNER (2242zc) reiterates his view that first-century Pharisaism cannot be accurately reconstructed from rabbinic sources, and that the New Testament and Josephus have much about the Pharisees that is not to be found in the rabbinic corpus.

MACCOBY (2242zd), pp. 59–63, says that Josephus, in his partisanship for the Romans, is, on the whole, opposed to the Pharisees, as wild men and trouble-makers. We may, however, note that in his key summary of the four sects, Josephus compliments the Pharisees most of all (Ant. 18. 12–15) as having inspired the masses to practice the highest ideals.

SILVA (2242ze) has a review-article on GUTTMANN (2242zf), NEUSNER (2242zg) (2242zh), and especially RIVKIN (2242f). He concludes that the last is essentially right, though overly dramatic, in speaking of the Pharisaic revolution, in insisting that the Pharisees were a class of scholars who are to be viewed primarily as exponents of the Oral Torah and that they should not be characterized as essentially sectarian and ritualistic. To be sure, he objects to RIVKIN's citation of Antiquities 13. 297 to prove that the Oral Law was created *ex nihilo* within a generation, and declares that Josephus is here describing John Hyrcanus' break with the Pharisees, who had transmitted to the people certain laws handed down by the fathers. The meaning, therefore, is that the Pharisees were transmitting something that had existed for some time. Moreover, our primary historical source, I Maccabees, knows nothing of a Pharisaic revolution.

## 22.3: The Pharisees in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities'

- (2246b) DAVID GOODBLATT: The Origins of the Roman Recognition of the Palestinian Patriarchate (in Hebrew). In: Meḥkarim be-Toledoth 'Am-Yisrael ve-Erez-Yisrael

(Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel) 4, Haifa 1978, pp. 89–102.

GOODBLATT (2246b) cites SMITH's (2243) thesis approvingly in presenting his theory that the Romans appointed Gamaliel II as patriarch because they realized that they had to favor the Pharisees in order to control the Jews in Palestine.

## 22.5: The Beliefs and Practices of the Pharisees

(2286ba) JACOB NEUSNER: The Written Tradition in the Pre-Rabbinic Period. In: *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 4, 1973, pp. 56–65.

NEUSNER (2286ba) takes issue with BAUMGARTEN (2286a), insisting that the latter does not take seriously the fact that Josephus' 'Antiquities' was composed at the end of the first century, at which time we have good evidence that the Yavnean authorities did claim orally to formulate and to transmit their traditions, and that Josephus' statement is, consequently, of no value in establishing the existence of an oral tradition for the earlier period.

## 22.6: The History of the Pharisees: Opposition to Hellenism, to the Hasmonean Kings, and to the Great War against Rome

(2299f) FERDINAND DEXINGER: Die Geschichte der Pharisäer. In: *Bibel und Kirche* 35, 1980, pp. 113–117.

(2299g) CLEMENS THOMA: Spiritualität der Pharisäer. In: *Bibel und Kirche* 25, 1980, pp. 117–122.

(2299h) LEE I. LEVINE: The Political Struggle between Pharisees and Sadducees in the Hasmonean Period (in Hebrew). In: AHARON OPPENHEIMER, URIEL RAPPAPORT, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Jerusalem 1980. Pp. 61–83.

DEXINGER (2299f) has a brief survey of the history of the Pharisees from their beginning, which he finds in the period before the Maccabean rebellion, to the destruction of the Temple in 70. He stresses, following Josephus, their relations with the various rulers, Jewish and non-Jewish, of the land, and notes the important Pharisaic leaders.

THOMA (2299g) concludes that the Pharisees showed their spirituality and concern for morality in their efforts to influence public life in accordance with the divine revelation of the Written and especially the Oral Law.

LEVINE (2299h) says that it was John Hyrcanus rather than the Pharisees who instituted the breach between them, since Hyrcanus sought a close relationship with the Sadducees, who had helped the Hasmoneans greatly politically and militarily. We may note, however, in opposition to LEVINE, the fact that the Mishnah (Ma'aser Sheni 5. 15) ascribes outstanding achievements to him and that Josephus (Ant. 13. 299), himself a Pharisee, says that he administered the

government excellently for thirty-one years and that he was accounted worthy by G-d Himself of three of the greatest privileges – the kingship, the high-priesthood, and prophecy. LEVINE also remarks that Josephus omits mention of the opposition of the Pharisees to Alexander Jannaeus, even though they must have been much involved in politics, because he wished to present them as responsible leaders. We may comment that Josephus (Ant. 13. 402) does state that Jannaeus had come into conflict with the “nation” (τῷ ἔθνει) because the Pharisees had been badly treated by him. The fact that on his deathbed, in remorse, Jannaeus advised Salome Alexandra to yield a certain amount of power to the Pharisees makes sense only if, indeed, he himself had not done so. We may also ask why if Josephus wished to present the Pharisees as responsible leaders he mentioned their opposition to John Hyrcanus.

## 22.7: The Relationship of the Pharisees to Apocalyptic Groups and to the Dead Sea Sect

- (2309c) JAMES H. CHARLESWORTH: *The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran Essenes*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 10, 1980, pp. 213–233.

CHARLESWORTH (2309c) notes that reliable traditions in both the Talmud (Kiddushin 66a) and Josephus (Ant. 13. 288–298) indicate that toward the end of his reign John Hyrcanus had a falling out with the Pharisees and even crucified eight hundred of them (War 1. 96–98 and Ant. 13. 380–383). He remarks that the possibility that it was Pharisees who then went to Qumran is confirmed by the fact that both an Essene and a Pharisaic type of phylacteries have been found at Qumran. We may comment that this hardly proves the identification: a more likely explanation is that just as there was a disagreement among the Essenes as to whether marriage should be permitted, so there was one as to which type of phylacteries to don.

## 22.11: The Texts Pertaining to the Essenes in Josephus

- (2333a) EDMOND B. SZÉKELY: *The Essene Book of Creation: Our Spiritual Heritage for the Space Age*. San Diego 1968.
- (2333b) EDMOND B. SZÉKELY: *The Essene Science of Life as Applied to Health and Disease by the First Century Essene Brotherhood at the Dead Sea and Translated into Contemporary Terms Based on the Essene Gospel of Peace. The Aramaic and Old Slavonic Texts Compared, Edited, and Translated*. San Diego 1970.
- (2334h) MARTIN A. LARSON: *The Essene-Christian Faith: A Study in the Sources of Western Religion*. New York 1980.

I have not seen SZÉKELY (2333a) (2333b).

LARSON (2334h), pp. 160–164, quotes, with little comment, portions of Josephus' account of the Essenes in Book 2 of the 'War'.

## 22.12: Josephus' Account of the Essenes: General

Supra, p. 585 ad 2357g: ORY summarizes the scholarship concerning the Essenes before 1947 and since 1947, refusing to accept the identification of the Essenes and the Dead Sea Sect. He stresses (pp. 14–22) but hardly proves that Josephus' text concerning the Essenes in Book 2 of the 'War' is translated from Aramaic and that it suffers from this fact.

(2357l) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.–A.D. 135). A New English Version Revised and Edited by GEZA VERMES, FERGUS MILLAR, and MATTHEW BLACK. Vol. 2. Edinburgh 1979.

(2357m) HYAM MACCOBY: *Revolution in Judaea: Jesus and the Jewish Resistance*. New York 1980.

(2357n) JAMES H. CHARLESWORTH: *The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran Essenes*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 10, 1979–80, pp. 213–233.

The new edition of SCHÜRER (2357l), pp. 562–574, has a considerable revision of the original version. It adopts the view identifying the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes on the ground that while the identity cannot be proven, the other hypotheses identifying the Qumran sect with the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Zealots, the Christians, or the Karaites are less satisfactory.

MACCOBY (2357m), pp. 71–74, unconvincingly asserts that the Essenes or the Dead Sea Sect, if they were identical, belong to the history of the Sadducees.

CHARLESWORTH (2357n) argues against the *communis opinio* that the Essenes came to an end in 68 and asserts that the evidence from Masada proves that the sect was still flickering at least until 74. We may comment, however, that the manuscript of the Dead Sea Sect that was found there (even if the Sect be identified with the Essenes) may have been placed there earlier.

## 22.13: The Authenticity of Josephus' Account of the Essenes

(2361a) GEORGES ORY: *A la recherches des Esséniens. Essai critique*. Paris 1975.

ORY (2361a) follows DEL MEDICO (2359), stressing that the Essenes are mentioned neither in Josippon nor in the Syriac translation of Book 6 of the 'Jewish War'. We may, however, note that they are not mentioned in the Greek of Book 6 also.

## 22.16: The Origin of the Essenes

(2392e) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.–A.D. 135). A New English Version Revised and Edited by GEZA VERMES, FERGUS MILLAR, and MATTHEW BLACK. Vol. 2. Edinburgh 1979.

(2392f) DORON MENDELS: *Hellenistic Utopia and the Essenes*. In: *Harvard Theological Review* 72, 1979, pp. 207–222.

SCHÜRER (2392e), pp. 585–590, finds it hard to accept the theory of Essene dependence upon Pythagorean teachings.

MENDELS (2392f) denies the influence of Pythagoreanism upon the Essenes, noting that after 250 B. C. E. until the first century C. E. Pythagoreanism was not fashionable; but this, we may remark, assumes that the Essenes arose in the middle of the second century B. C. E., when they are first mentioned by Josephus – an assumption that we have questioned. MENDELS notes a number of similarities between the Essenes as described by Josephus and as seen in the Dead Sea Scrolls (he assumes that they are identical) and the utopia of Iambulus (ap. Diodorus 2. 55–60): isolation from the outside world, the goal of *ὁμόνοια*, the importance of elders, the prohibition of private ownership of property, common meals, asceticism, baptism, opposition to marriage because it is destructive of communal life and property, worship of the sun, simple burial, dualism, love of learning and especially of astrology, and special healing virtue in the use of fauna and flora. He concludes that the first Essenes were influenced by Hellenistic utopias. The fact, moreover, that Josephus does not insert into his account the familiar *τόποι* of classical and Hellenistic utopias, even where we would expect them shows that he has depicted the Essenes accurately, according to MENDELS. We may respond that the chances that pietists such as the Essenes would be influenced by Iambulus are not great, especially if, as Josephus says, they go back to remote antiquity. It is, we may add, rather more likely that Iambulus had heard of the Essenes and was influenced by them, in view of his interest in the exotic, than that the Essenes had heard of Iambulus.

## 22.18: Beliefs and Practices of the Essenes: General

(2400a) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B. C. – A. D. 135). A New English Version Revised and Edited by GEZA VERMES, FERGUS MILLAR, and MATTHEW BLACK. Vol. 2. Edinburgh 1979.

SCHÜRER (2400a) says that Josephus' statement (Ant. 13. 172) that the Essenes did not believe in free will is to be understood only in the sense of an absolute belief in Providence, and that in this respect as in others the Essenes were merely exaggerated Pharisees, as they were in their reverence for the Law and for the Lawgiver. This view, we may comment, is supported by Josephus' statement (Ant. 18. 18) that the Essenes were wont to leave everything in the hands of G-d.

## 22.20: Ritual and Practices of the Essenes: Initiation, Baths, Purity, Asceticism, Prayer, Work

(2425a) JOSEPH M. BAUMGARTEN: *The Pharisaic-Sadducean Controversies about Purity and the Qumran Texts*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31, 1980, pp. 157–170.

BAUMGARTEN (2425a) notes that one would suppose that the Essenes who had bathed (War 2. 129) were in a state equivalent to *tebul yom* (one who has

bathed but has not waited until evening); and yet, they were considered as pure and were permitted to eat the communal meal. BAUMGARTEN, however, questions this inference and suggests that the communal meals of the Essenes were patterned after the rites of the Temple, which were always preceded by purification. He sees a similarity between the Sadducees and the Qumran sect in the rejection of the concept of *tebul yom*.

## 22.29: The Relationship of the Essenes to the Dead Sea Sect

- (2543 zi) JEAN POUILLY: *La Règle de la Communauté de Qumrân: son évolution littéraire* (Cahiers de Revue Biblique, 17). Paris 1976.
- (2543 zj) JEAN POUILLY: *Les manuscrits de la mer Morte et la Communauté de Qumrân*. Paris 1979. Trans. into Spanish by N. DARRICAL: *Los manuscritos del Mar Muerto y la comunidad de Qumrân* (Documentos en torno a la biblia, 2). Estella-Navarra 1980.
- (2543 zk) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C. – A.D. 135). A New English Version Revised and Edited by GEZA VERMES, FERGUS MILLIAR, and MATTHEW BLACK. Vol. 2. Edinburgh 1979.
- (2543 zl) JEAN CARMIGNAC: *Qui était le Docteur de Justice?* In: *Revue de Qumran* 10, 1979–80, pp. 235–246.
- (2543 zm) JAMES H. CHARLESWORTH: *The Origin and Subsequent History of the Authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Four Transitional Phases among the Qumran Essenes*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 10, 1979–80, pp. 213–233.
- (2543 zn) ANDRÉ DUPONT-SOMMER: *Les Écrits esséniens découverts près de la mer Morte* (Bibliothèque historique, 4th rev. ed.). Paris 1980.
- (2543 zo) MICHAEL E. STONE: *Scriptures, Sects and Visions. A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts*. Philadelphia 1980.
- (2543 zp) GEZA VERMES: *The Essenes and History*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 32, 1981, pp. 18–31.

POUILLY (2543 zi), in order to explain the diverse elements of the Rule of the Community, speaks of the development in stages of the sect.

POUILLY (2543 zj) surveys the beliefs and practices of the Dead Sea Sect, their relation to the Essenes and to Christianity, and the nature of their Biblical exegesis, in the light of Josephus and the archaeological evidence.

SCHÜRER (2543 zk), pp. 575–585, surveys the Qumran community in the light of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Josephus.

CARMIGNAC (2543 zl) contends that Judas the Essene (War 1. 78–80, Ant. 13. 304–313) is to be identified with the Dead Sea Sect's Teacher of Righteousness, since both are old and have numerous disciples. We may reply, however, that these are commonplaces, and we may note that in the Talmud the term "old man" is a synonym for a wise man.

CHARLESWORTH (2543 zm) argues that the identification of the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes has now been confirmed by some passages in the Temple Scroll, notably the prohibition of natural excretion within Jerusalem and the provisions for a latrine situated 3000 metres from the city, which are reminiscent of the habits of the Essenes (War 2. 147–149) – the strict attitude toward marriage, the prohibition of divorce, and the denial of the king's right to have more than one wife, which are similar to what Josephus (War 2. 120 and

160–161) and Dionysios Bar Salibi (*Against the Jews*, chap. 1) say about the Essenes. The Essenes, CHARLESWORTH stresses, were a movement not limited to the Qumran area, since Josephus (*Ant.* 18. 20) and Philo (*Quod omnis probus liber sit* 75) state that they numbered about 4000, whereas Qumran could scarcely have supported 300 people.

DUPONT-SOMMER (2543zn), in a revision of his first edition, which was published in 1959, brings his bibliography up to date, though in a very selective and incomplete way.

STONE (2543zo), p. 69, identifies the Sect with the Essenes, as described by Josephus, but notes that the people who lived at Qumran were not the only type of Essenes, since Josephus refers to various groups of Essenes.

VERMES (2543zp) resolves the discrepancies between the Sect and the Essenes by noting that Josephus' testimony as to a duality of Essene discipline with regard to marriage is confirmed by some of the Dead Sea writings and by Qumran archaeology. Secondly, the Scrolls reflect the ideas of members of the Sect and are intended for initiates, whereas those who write about the Essenes were outsiders; and even Josephus (*Life* 9–12) had only an unfinished Essene apprenticeship to his credit. Finally, he asserts, to reject the identity is to conclude that the Qumran relics belong to a hitherto totally unknown Jewish sect almost identical with the Essenes. We may comment, however, that in view of the fact that there were apparently, at least according to the Jerusalem Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 10. 6. 29c), many sects during this period of which we know nothing, a relatively small group living near the Dead Sea might well have escaped notice in the small percentage of literature of the period that is extant.

## 22.30: The Relation of the Essenes to the Christians

(2560a) MARTIN A. LARSON: *The Essene-Christian Faith: A Study in the Sources of Western Religion*. New York 1980.

LARSON (2560a), pp. 196–234, reiterates his highly hypothetical views that the early Christians were individual Essenes who defected soon after the crucifixion, and that after the destruction of the Temple in 70, large numbers of Jews joined the Christian sect and became known as Ebionites.

## 22.35: The Relationship of the Zealots to the Essenes and to the Dead Sea Sect

(2631e) JEAN STARCKY: *S. Jean Baptiste et les Esséniens*. In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 180, 1976, pp. 6–8.

STARCKY (2631e) cites Josephus' 'War' to support his theory that the Essenes joined the Zealots in the Jewish revolt against the Romans..



**22.36: The Relationship of the Zealots to Jesus and to Early Christianity**

- (2640u) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: Jesus and the Zealots: Aftermath. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 54, 1971–72, pp. 47–66.

BRANDON (2640u), replying to KLASSEN (2639), WINK (2640f), and the review by HENGEL (in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 14, 1969, pp. 231–240) of his book, 'Jesus and the Zealots', insists that Jesus died as a martyr for Israel, as indeed many Zealots did, because he spoke out against the injustice and impiety of Roman rule and against the Jewish sacerdotal aristocracy that collaborated with it. Our one certain fact, he concludes, is that the Romans did execute Jesus for sedition.

**22.37: The Sicarii, the Fourth Philosophy, and the Zealots**

- (2690j) EMIL SCHÜRER: The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135). A New English Version Revised and Edited by GEZA VERMES, FERGUS MILLAR, and MATTHEW BLACK. Vol. 2. Edinburgh 1979.
- (2690k) MICHAEL E. STONE: *Scriptures, Sects and Visions. A Profile of Judaism from Ezra to the Jewish Revolts*. Philadelphia 1980.

SCHÜRER (2690j) has a new appendix by R. HAYWARD on the Sicarii and the Zealots.

STONE (2690k), pp. 71–72, identifies the Fourth Philosophy with the Zealots.

**22.38: The Galilaeans**

- (2695a) FRANCIS X. MALINOWSKI: Torah Tendencies in Galilean Judaism according to Flavius Josephus, with Gospel Comparisons. In: *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 10, 1980, pp. 30–36.
- (2697a) FRANCIS LOFTUS: *The Galileans in Josephus and Jewish Tradition: A Study in Jewish Nationalism*. Diss., B. Phil., St. Andrews 1975.
- (2699a) SEAN FREYNE: Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism (Studies in Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity, 5). Wilmington, Delaware and Notre Dame, Indiana 1980.
- (2699b) SEAN FREYNE: The Galileans in the Light of Josephus' *Vita*. In: *New Testament Studies* 26, 1980, pp. 397–413.
- (2699c) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: The Term 'Galileans' in Josephus. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 72, 1981–82, pp. 50–52.
- (2699d) SEAN FREYNE: Galilean Religion of the First Century against Its Social Background. In: *Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association* 5, 1981, pp. 98–114.

MALINOWSKI (2695a) insists that it is wrong to regard the Galilaeans as being less than conscientious in their attitude toward the Torah, since Josephus (Life 196–198) points out their reverence for the Torah, the priesthood, and Jerusalem. MALINOWSKI suggests that Johanan ben Zakkai's lament, "O Galilee, Galilee! Thou hatest the Torah" (Jerusalem Talmud, Shabbath 16. 8), is anachronistic or

perhaps refers to their ignorance, rather than to their indifference to the Torah. He cites Judas of Galilee as a representative type of Galilaean Judaism.

For LOFTUS (2697a), see *supra*, p. 669.

FREYNE (2699a), pp. 208–255, argues for a theory of a predominantly peasant ethos for Galilee. He claims that very little of the intense feeling of social unrest and apocalyptic fervor came to Galilee as compared to Judea. He argues that Galilee, because of its rural nature, was not deeply affected by Hellenistic and Roman cultural influences or by the Jewish revolutionary movement or by early Christianity.

FREYNE (2699b) concludes that in Josephus the term Galilaean is primarily a geographical one, but that in the 'Life' the Galilaean is the inhabitants of the country as distinguished from those of the cities. He takes issue with ZEITLIN (2697) and insists that the Galilaean was militantly nationalistic but not essentially revolutionary or subversive. As to the cause and extent of Galilaean animosity toward the larger towns, he finds that the matter is hardly simple and cannot be explained merely by the pro-Roman stance of the towns, since, with the exception of Sepphoris, their pro-Roman attitudes were never explicit.

I (2699c) argue that Josephus did not regard the Galilaean as a distinct political party, since he says (Ant. 18. 37) that the new settlers of Tiberias were a promiscuous rabble, "no small contingent being Galilaean"; and it makes no sense for Herod the Tetrarch to have settled revolutionaries in his newly established city. Moreover, Josephus (War 2. 622) says that the Galilaean from one town after another flocked to him, and he recalls (Apion 1. 48) with pride that he was in command of those called Galilaean, an attitude that he would hardly have adopted if they were a revolutionary group. Finally, we may ask, if they were a revolutionary group, why is there no mention of them outside of Galilee, and why are they not included in the apparently exhaustive list of the five revolutionary groups (War 7. 262–274)? That the Galilaean is, indeed, the peasant is supported by the fact that Josephus never refers to the inhabitants of the major cities of Galilee as Galilaean.

FREYNE (2699d), co-ordinating Josephus and the Talmudic corpus, concludes that the Jews of Galilee in the first century resisted both Hellenism and apocalyptic zealotism and instead were attracted to such charismatic leaders as Hanina ben Dosa and Jesus.

## 22.40: Individual Revolutionary Leaders: Judas of Galilee, John of Gischala, Simon bar Giora, Menahem

(2702a) DAVID HILL: Jesus and Josephus' 'Messianic Prophets'. In: ERNEST BEST and R. McL. WILSON, ed., *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Cambridge 1979. Pp. 143–154.

(2705h) URIEL RAPPAPORT: John of Gischala. In: *A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 18.

HILL (2702a) notes that Judas the Galilaeen (War 2. 118 and Ant. 18. 23) was not a Messianic pretender but a charismatic teacher.

RAPPAPORT (2705h) explains the hostility between Josephus and John of Gischala as part of the inner conflict of the same moderate party. John, he says, joined the revolt only because of bad relations between the Jews of Upper Galilee and the Tyrians and the subsequent Roman aggression against the Jews. John himself must have felt no social kinship with the Sicarii or with Simon bar Giora or with their Messianic hopes, since he came from a comfortable middle-class background.

### 23.0: Josephus on John the Baptist

Supra, p. 679 ad 2720q: STARCKY, in a popular article, notes the differences, but especially the resemblances, between John and the Essenes, with whom he identifies the Qumran sect.

(2720v) DAVID HILL: Jesus and Josephus' 'Messianic Prophets'. In: ERNEST BEST and R. MCL. WILSON, edd., *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Cambridge 1979. Pp. 143–154.

(2720w) L. F. BADIA: *The Qumran Baptism and John the Baptist's Baptism*. Lanham, Maryland 1980.

HILL (2720v) accepts Josephus' version of why John was put to death, noting that at a time when a large proportion of the Jews were unable to differentiate between religious and political hopes, John could scarcely have avoided being regarded by the authorities as a potential source of political disturbance.

BADIA (2720w) compares in detail what Josephus and the Synoptic Gospels have to say about John's baptism with the practice at Qumran as evidenced by archaeological remains and by the *Manual of Discipline*.

### 23.2: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': General

(2774f) CARROLL V. NEWSOM: *The Roots of Christianity*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1979.

NEWSOM (2774f), p. 126, concludes that Josephus, in his original writings, made no mention of Jesus, since he did not regard him as important.

Supra, p. 689 ad 2774s: DUBARLE reconstructs the original text of the 'Testimonium' on the basis of Agapius, Michael the Syrian, and various translations or citations in ancient Latin writers and in Byzantine chroniclers.

Supra, p. 689 ad 2774t: ORY, noting that the 'Testimonium' as we have it interrupts a series of troubles, contends that it is not authentic and that the version in the Slavonic Josephus is worthless.

(2774zh) AMBROGIO DONINI: In: MARIA LUISA ASTALDI, ed., *La Figura di Gesù Cristo*. Firenze 1976. Pp. 25–34.

(2774zi) ANGELO AMATO: Il Gesu' Storico: Problemi e Interpretazioni. In: *Salesianum* 39, 1977, pp. 296–297.

I have not seen DONINI (2774zh), who, according to AMATO (2774zi), regards the 'Testimonium' as false and due to a Christian hand of the third or fourth century.

### 23.5: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': 'He was the Messiah'

Supra, p. 694 ad 2790d: HILL argues that in view of other Messianic-like figures mentioned in Josephus, Jesus' proclamation of the imminent coming of the kingdom would hardly appear to be a unique feature of his message. Similarly, the prediction of the inevitable destruction of the Temple was a standard feature of first-century Messianic preaching. These Messianic prophets, like Jesus, claimed to work miracles. HILL notes, however, that Josephus does not refer to any other Messianic prophet of this period as σοφός, and that the teaching of Jesus will thus emerge as more complex than many reconstructions suggest. We may, however, comment that this may be merely another reason for rejecting the authenticity of Josephus' reference to Jesus as σοφός in the 'Testimonium'.

### 23.10: The Arabic and Syriac Versions of the 'Testimonium Flavianum'

(2817a) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: Jésus d'après Flavius Josèphe. In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 154, 1973, pp. 22–23.

(2818la) JAN RADOZYCKI: Świadectwo Józefa Flawiusza o Chrystusie w świetle nowo odkrytego tekstu (in Polish = The Evidence of Josephus Flavius on Christ). In: *Zycie i Mysl* 29. 7–8, 1979, pp. 75–80.

DUBARLE (2817a) presents an abbreviated form of his article (2817).

I have been unable to read RADOZYCKI (2818la), who, according to the summary in *New Testament Abstracts*, claims that the authenticity of the 'Testimonium' has now been upheld by the Arabic version of Agapius, but that the statement in the 'Testimonium' about Jesus' messiahship was modified by a Christian.

### 23.11: Jesus son of Ananias

(2818p) AUGUST STROBEL: *Die Stunde der Wahrheit. Untersuchungen zum Strafverfahren gegen Jesus*. Tübingen 1980.

I have not seen STROBEL (2818p), pp. 24–25, who, according to a communication from HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG, comments on War 6. 300–309.

### 23.12: Josephus on James

- (2825r) GEORGES ORY: Le mythe et l'histoire. In: Cahiers du Cercle Ernest Renan 21/80, 1973, pp. 1–8.  
 (2825s) AUGUST STROBEL: Die Stunde der Wahrheit. Untersuchungen zum Strafverfahren gegen Jesus. Tübingen 1980.

ORY (2825r) comments on the fact that the statement ascribed by Eusebius to Josephus that the fall of Jerusalem was due to the crime committed against James is not to be found in our texts of Josephus.

I have not seen STROBEL (2825s), pp. 31–36, who, according to a communication from HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG, comments on Josephus' account of the execution of James.

### 23.14: The Census of Quirinius in Josephus and in Luke

- (2873h) LOUIS DUPRAZ: De l'association de Tibère au principat à la naissance du Christ. Fribourg 1966.

DUPRAZ (2873h), pp. 143–220, commenting on the census of Quirinius and on the creation of the procuratorial province of Judea, concludes that Josephus and Luke do not contradict each other, and that there are only the silences of Josephus, namely those of his silence on the government of Quirinius in Syria before Varus and those of his silence on all the public life of Jesus and on his death.

### 23.15: Theudas in Josephus and in Acts

- (2885d) DAVID HILL: Jesus and Josephus' 'Messianic Prophets'. In: ERNEST BEST and R. McL. WILSON, ed., Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black. Cambridge 1979. Pp. 143–154.

HILL (2885d) notes that no matter how we explain the divergence between Acts 5. 36–37 and Josephus, what is of interest is that the followers of Jesus are compared with the supporters of Judas and Theudas, both of whom had, temporarily at least, clashed with Roman interests in Palestine.

### 23.16: Other Parallels between Josephus and Luke-Acts

- (2891p) F. GERALD DOWNING: Redaction Criticism: Josephus' *Antiquities* and the Synoptic Gospels. In: Journal for the Study of the New Testament 8, 1980, pp. 46–65; 9, 1980, pp. 29–48.  
 (2891q) F. GERALD DOWNING: Ethical Pagan Theism and the Speeches in Acts. In: New Testament Studies 27, 1981, pp. 544–563.  
 (2891r) FAUSTO PARENTE: L'episodio dell'Egiziano in Acta 21. 38. Qualche osservazione sulla possibile dipendenza degli Atti degli Apostoli da Flavio Giuseppe. In: Rendi-

conti dell'Istituto Lombardo, Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche 112, 1978, pp. 360–376.

- (2891s) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Flavius Josephus und die lukanischen Schriften*. In: WILFRID HAUBECK and MICHAEL BACHMANN, edd., *Wort in der Zeit: Neutestamentliche Studien*. Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorf zum 75. Geburtstag. Leiden 1980. Pp. 179–209.

DOWNING (2891p) cites parallels in language and aims among Josephus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1. 1–8), and Luke. We may add that DOWNING might have noted parallels in subject matter between Luke and Josephus with regard to the census, Theudas, Lysanias, Judas, etc.

DOWNING (2891q) notes that in vocabulary Josephus is very close to Luke-Acts and, in any case, is closer to it than to any other part of the canon of the New Testament. He notes that both Luke and Josephus were writing during the same decade, explaining teachings, practices, and events stemming from the Jewish Scriptures in Greek translation, concentrating on the same recent period of history, and quite often on the same protagonists. In particular, Luke's proem is closely matched by Josephus' statement of his intentions as an historian, writing for a distinguished patron. Finally, many of the speeches in both Josephus and Luke show the following common broad outline: 1) G-d is powerful; 2) we must, therefore, be virtuous, keeping the ancient rules; 3) we shall then enjoy the good life; and 4) we shall then escape the unpleasant alternatives.

PARENTE (2891r) concludes that the narrative of the arrest of Paul in Acts 21. 38 is dependent upon Josephus' story of the false prophet from Egypt (War 2. 261–263, Ant. 20. 169–172).

SCHRECKENBERG (2891s) argues that Josephus and Luke had access to different sources and are independent of one another. Hence, both are of value for reconstructing the events which they describe.

#### 24.1: The Conversion of King Izates of Adiabene to Judaism

- (2918c) LAWRENCE H. SCHIFFMAN: *Proselytism in the Writings of Josephus: Izates of Adiabene in Light of the Halakah*. In: *A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 9.

SCHIFFMAN (2918c) concludes that the reason why Ananias advised Izates not to be circumcised was that he feared the political consequences. He therefore urged Izates to remain one of the semi-proselytes described by Josephus (Apion 2. 281–284) and by other sources.

#### 25.0: Josephus and the Geography, Topography, and Archaeology of the Land of Israel: General

- (2942a) ZEEV SAFRAI: *The Administrative Structure of Judaea in the Roman Period* (in Hebrew). In: *Mehkarim be-Toledoth 'Am-Yisrael ve-Erez-Yisrael* (Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel) 4, Haifa 1978, pp. 103–136.

- (2957n) ZEEV SAFRAI: The Description of Eretz-Israel in Josephus' Works. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 26–28.

SAFRAI (2942a) accepts the view of STERN (2942) that the slight differences between the divisions of Palestine as described by Josephus (War 3. 54–58) and by Pliny (Nat. Hist. 5. 14. 70) reflect merely the differences in time between the two lists.

SAFRAI (2957n) notes that there are internal inconsistencies in Josephus' description (War 3. 35–58) of the Land of Israel, inasmuch as the valleys of Beth-Shean and of Jezreel are not described, the account of agriculture in Samaria is not attached to that of Judea, and the Coastal Plain is not charted. Josephus' major source, he postulates, was one dating from the beginning of the reign of John Hyrcanus which charted the land in terms of Jewish administration and settlement. He further remarks that Josephus' descriptions of the allotments to the Twelve Tribes (Ant. 5. 80–87) and of the commissions given to Solomon's provincial governors (Ant. 8. 35–38) have been influenced by the contemporary administrative division of the country. We may, however, comment that the administrative division of the land in Josephus' day may well have continued the earlier division, since this was the usual practice among conquerors.

## 25.2: Caesarea

- (2968m) AVNER RABAN: Josephus and the Herodian Harbour of Caesarea. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 22–23.

RABAN (2968m) notes that, though most modern scholars have cast doubt on Josephus' description of Caesarea, since more important ports built during this period have proved to have a lower technological standard, archaeological discoveries at Caesarea during the past five years have confirmed the reliability of Josephus' description. Indeed, Herod's harbor here anticipated Roman engineering feats elsewhere by several generations.

## 25.7: Herodium

- (2986e) YORAM TSAFRIR: On the Symmetry of Herodium, 'Megalomania' in Herod's Architecture and Roman Technology in Its Formation (in Hebrew). In: Cathedra 15, 1980, pp. 56–60.

TSAFRIR (2986e) notes Roman influence in Herod's building techniques at Herodium.

## 25.8: Jericho

- (2988d) RACHEL HACHLILI: A Second Temple Period Jewish Necropolis in Jericho. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 43, 1980, pp. 235–240.
- (2988e) EHUD NETZER: The Triclinia of Herod as the Prototype of the Galilean Synagogue Plan (in Hebrew). In: AHARON OPPENHEIMER, URIEL RAPPAPORT, and MENAHEM STERN, edd., *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Jerusalem 1980. Pp. 108–118.

HACHLILI (2988d) remarks that Jericho became the second largest city in Judea during the period of the Second Temple. Puzzled by the sudden appearance of ossuary burials, she notes, as Josephus stresses, that the period after 6 C.E. was characterized by political and religious unrest, and suggests that because of their misfortunes the Jews saw themselves as sinners and consequently adopted the custom of secondary burial of the bones (after decay of the flesh) in order to atone for their sins.

NETZER (2988e) theorizes that two large triclinia excavated at Jericho, as well as similar halls built by Herod in Jerusalem and described by Josephus, served as the model of synagogues built in Galilee two centuries later.

## 25.9: Jerusalem

Supra, p. 751 ad 3001 (MAZAR): The Herodian stairway which has been found leading westward from the broad street which runs along the Western Wall towards the Upper City may very well be the beginning of the stairs mentioned by Josephus at the end of this passage (Ant. 15.410).

- (3001p) ERNEST-MARIE LAPERROUSAZ: L'extension préexilique de Jérusalem sur la colline occidentale. Réfutation décisive de la « minimalist view » mise à l'honneur voilà vingt ans. In: *Revue des Études juives* 134, 1975, pp. 3–30.
- (3001q) NAHMAN AVIGAD: Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, 1970 (Second Preliminary Report). In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 20, 1970, pp. 132–134.
- (3001r) NAHMAN AVIGAD: Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem, 1971 (third Preliminary Report). In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 22, 1972, pp. 193–200.
- (3001s) RICHARD M. MACKOWSKI: *Jerusalem, City of Jesus. An Exploration of the Traditions, Writings, and Remains of the Holy City from the Time of Christ*. Grand Rapids 1980.
- (3001t) MICHAEL AVI-YONAH: The Archaeology and Typography of Jerusalem in the Days of the Second Temple (in Hebrew). In: MICHAEL AVI-YONAH, ed., *The Book of Jerusalem: Jerusalem; its Natural Conditions, History and Development from the Origins to the Present Day*, vol. 1: *The Natural Conditions and the History of the City from its Origins to the Destruction of the Second Temple*. Jerusalem and Tel-Aviv 1956. Pp. 305–319.

LAPERROUSAZ (3001p), following AVIGAD (3001q) (3001r), notes that recent archaeological discoveries have brought to light an authentic pre-exilic site of Jerusalem on the Western hill, thus confirming the description of Josephus



and refuting the minimalist view of KENYON (3001h), according to which pre-exilic Jerusalem was confined to the Eastern hill, the expansion to the Western hill not having taken place prior to the second century B. C. E.

MACKOWSKI (3001s), on the basis largely of Josephus and of archaeological discoveries, surveys the geography, topography, and chief buildings of Jerusalem before the destruction of the Temple in 70.

AVI-YONAH (3001t), relying chiefly on Josephus but co-ordinating him with archaeological discoveries, briefly describes the city of Jerusalem, especially its walls and towers, on the eve of the Jewish revolt against the Romans.

## 25.10: The Walls of Jerusalem

(3014ia) BRUCE E. SCHEIN: The Second Wall of Jerusalem. In: *Biblical Archeologist* 44, 1981, pp. 21–26.

SCHEIN (3014ia) says that Josephus gives us indirect evidence that the entire area where the Church of the Redeemer now stands in Jerusalem was once a stone quarry, since if the Second Wall ran behind the stone quarry it would have been impossible for the Romans to move a battering ram against the wall: hence we can understand why the Romans attacked from the northern side. He agrees with KENYON (3014j) that Herod may have been the builder of the Second Wall, since recent excavations have discovered Herodian material in the layer just above the quarry.

## 25.11: The Antonia in Jerusalem

(3020c) TH. A. BUSINK: Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes. Eine archäologisch-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus. Vol. 2: Von Ezechiel bis Middot. Leiden 1980. Pp. 701–1611.

BUSINK (3020c), pp. 1233–1249, in the course of his exhaustive treatment, which is based primarily on Josephus, concludes that north of the Antonia on the same hill stood an outwork, and that the Jews during the siege of the tower gave it up almost without a struggle.

## 25.12: Other Sites in Jerusalem

(3031m) BARGIL PIXNER: An Essene Quarter on Mount Zion? In: *Studia Hierosolymitana in onore di P. Bellarmino Bagatti*. Vol. 1 (*Studii Biblici Franciscani Collectio Maior*, 22). Jerusalem 1976. Pp. 245–284.

(3031n) DAVID USSISHKIN: The 'Camp of the Assyrians' in Jerusalem. In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 29, 1979, pp. 137–142.

(3031o) HILLEL GEVA: The 'Tower of David' – Phasael or Hippicus? In: *Israel Exploration Journal* 31, 1981, pp. 57–65.

PIXNER (3031m) concludes, on the basis of Josephus' description of the Western Wall, as well as the ritual prescription with its geographical specification in the Temple Scroll, and the localization of the toponym *So'* of the Copper Scroll, that the Qumran-Essenes had a quarter on the southwestern hill of Jerusalem. This identification is supported, he says, by Josephus' statement (War 2. 124) that the Essenes were settled in large numbers in every town; but we may reply that no inscription has yet been found in all the excavations in Jerusalem mentioning Essenes; and if, indeed, they were to be found in any numbers in Jerusalem the chances are that they would have played a role, one way or another, during the siege of the city, whereas Josephus mentions them not at all in this connection.

USSISHKIN (3031 n) argues that tactical considerations support the location of the Assyrian camp described by Josephus (War 5. 303–307) on the Northwest Hill, and that inasmuch as the strategic advantage of this hill did not change, Titus also chose it as the site of his camp.

GEVA (3031 o) rejects the common view which identifies the Tower of David as Phasael, though he admits that Josephus' figures seem to be in accord with this, and prefers the identification with Hippicus. He notes that we lack information as to the size of Josephus' cubit, and that, in general, Josephus is inexact in his descriptions of buildings. For example, Josephus states that the three towers in this area are square, whereas the Tower of David is rectangular. Josephus likewise exaggerates the size of the blocks used in building them. And yet, Josephus' differentiation between the substructure of Hippicus as against the other two towers has been confirmed by archaeological finds. GEVA's identification is particularly influenced by Josephus' statement that the Tower of Hippicus was connected to the First and Third Walls.

### 25.13: Machaerus

(3036e) VIRGILIO C. CORBO: Macheronte. La Reggia-Fortezza Erodiانا. Rapporto preliminare alla seconda campagna di scavo: 3 settembre-20 ottobre 1979. In: *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 29, 1979, pp. 315–326.

(3036f) M. PICCIRILLO: Scavi italiani in Giordania; la fortezza di Macheronte. In: *Il Veltro* 23, 1979, pp. 575–585.

CORBO (3036e) concludes that Josephus' account (War 7. 175) is confirmed by excavations at Machaerus, but PICCIRILLO (3036f) disagrees.

### 25.17: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: General

(3112j) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: Masada: A Consideration of the Literary Evidence. In: *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 21, 1980, pp. 245–260.

(3112k) MAGEN BROSHI: The Credibility of Josephus. In: *A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 20.

LADOUCEUR (3112j) disagrees with my statement (3103) that the presence of several thousand soldiers, as well as prisoners of war, would have compelled Josephus to give a truthful account of such a spectacular event, since he doubts that anyone in Rome after such a war would have been inclined to charge a Flavian client with misrepresentation of the slaughter of rebellious Jews. We may reply that non-Jews might well have been jealous that a Jew had been so favored. The air of scandal, moreover, would have been heightened by Titus' affair with a Jewish woman, Berenice, Agrippa's sister. As to Jews, Josephus himself (Life 423) says that his privileged position excited envy and exposed him to danger; and he gives as an example (Life 424) the charge made by a certain Jew that Josephus had helped him in an insurrection in Cyrene.

BROSHI (3112k) emphasizes that archaeological finds show how astonishingly accurate Josephus is. Thus, though it is safe to assume that Josephus had never been at Masada, since a Roman military unit had been stationed there prior to the revolt, Josephus gives the length of Masada's wall as seven stades (about 1300 meters, War 7. 286), which is exact.

## 25.18: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: the Speeches of Eleazar ben Jair

(3119d) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: Masada: A Consideration of the Literary Evidence. In: Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 21, 1980, pp. 245–260.

(3119e) MENAHEM LUZ: Clearchus of Soli as a Source of Eleazar's Deuterostosis. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 12–13.

LADOUCEUR (3119d), after comparing Eleazar's speech advocating suicide with Josephus' speech at Jotapata condemning it, concludes that it was a change in historical circumstances that led to the change in attitude which Josephus displays. He suggests that the question of the propriety of suicide was a much debated question during the Neronian and Flavian periods on the part of those influenced by contemporary Cynicism and Stoicism and that, therefore, Josephus invested Eleazar with certain philosophical characteristics, the political significance of which would have been appreciated by a Greco-Roman audience at this time. Moreover, according to LADOUCEUR, the upper-class opposition of this period was characterized by an allusiveness or encoding. We may comment that if we compare the speeches in the 'War' with those in the 'Antiquities', those in the 'War' fit the pattern described by LADOUCEUR to a much higher degree, even though the work was written twenty years earlier, presumably because Josephus had the aid of his assistants in the 'War' and because the 'Antiquities' appeared during the reign of Domitian, when writers had to be more careful about what they said or implied. Those in the political opposition at Rome at this time also spoke of suicide, just as Eleazar did, according to LADOUCEUR. But LADOUCEUR must say that the phrase "nobility of resolve" with regard to the Sicarii is to be understood ironically, whereas in the context of the other

phrases of praise – “greatness of daring” and “contempt of death” (War 7. 405–406) – this seems hard to accept. Moreover, Josephus elsewhere almost never alludes to contemporary events, persons, or movements in Rome; and this is perhaps why he was one of the very few intellectuals to survive Domitian’s brutal suppression of freedom of thought. Finally, there is even a real question as to whether Josephus knew enough Latin to be able to appreciate orations on such topics.

LUZ (3119e) notes parallels between Eleazar’s second speech (War 7. 341–388) and Clearchus of Soli, notably in the description of the souls of those who sleep on earth as wandering through heaven and conversing with G-d, i.e. a commonplace parallel between the Jews and the Indian philosophers, in the soul’s prophecy at the time of sleep when it is sundered from the body, and in the comparison of death to sleep when the soul uses the body as a refuge.

## 25.19: Josephus’ Reliability as a Source for Masada: the Suicide

(3150f) S. DANIEL BRESLAUER: Guyana and Masada: the “No Alternative” Mentality. In: *Journal of Reform Judaism* 26. 3, Summer 1979, pp. 11–16.

(3150g) JUDEA B. MILLER: Doing an Ungrudging Kindness; Notes on Martyrdom. In: *Journal of Reform Judaism* 26. 3, Summer 1979, pp. 17–22.

BRESLAUER (3150f) discusses Masada as a precedent for the mass suicide of the 913 followers of Jim Jones in Jonestown, Guyana, in 1978, noting that the ‘no alternative’ mentality at Masada similarly resulted from alienation from general society, as seen, for example, in Josephus’ statement that the Zealots had already lost popular favor by the end of the siege of Jerusalem, as well as from the loss of self-image, when the defenders realized that they were not G-d’s elect, since the Romans were at their gates, and finally from compulsion, when the group felt that it had no will of its own but rather was impelled by G-d’s compulsion toward death.

MILLER (3150g), noting Masada and other parallels to the tragedy at Jonestown, is particularly interested in the survivors of these mass suicides.

## 25.23: Other Sites in Israel and Transjordan: Akbara etc.

(3165a) DAN URMAN: The Use of the Toponym Golan in Josephus’ Writings. In: *A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. Pp. 24–25.

(3173na) SHMARYAH GUTMAN: Gamala: The Excavations in the First Three Seasons (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1981.

URMAN (3165a) concludes that when Josephus (War 1. 90, 105; Ant. 4. 173, 13. 393) mentions Golan, he identifies it with the settlement of the same name which was destroyed by Alexander Jannaeus. When dealing with the Golan as an administrative unit he uses the form Gaulanitis. By Upper Golan

Josephus meant higher or Eastern Golan, as studies of the geology, hydrology, climate, and flora indicate.

GUTMAN (3173na), pp. 9–23, discusses the location, prior history, and Roman siege of Gamala, co-ordinating his archaeological finds with Josephus.

## 25.25: Josephus and Numismatic Evidence

Supra, p. 802 ad 3192d: BELL, in a popular, uncritical summary, notes that the motifs that appear on coins of most procurators are 'neutral' so as not to be offensive to the religious feelings of the Jews.

(3192g) ARYEH KINDLER: Hasmonean Coins. Diss. in progress. Tel-Aviv University.

KINDLER's (3192g) dissertation will apparently be a comprehensive and critical survey of the subject of the Hasmonean coins.

## 26.0: Dictionaries and Concordances to Josephus

(3200a) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: KARL H. RENGSTORF, ed., A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. Vol. 1: A–Δ. Leiden 1973. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94, 1975, pp. 628–631.

(3200b) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: KARL H. RENGSTORF, ed., A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. Vol. 2: E–K. Leiden 1975. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96, 1977, pp. 132–134.

(3200c) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: KARL H. RENGSTORF, ed., A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. Vol. 3: Λ–Π. Leiden 1979. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100, 1981, pp. 151–154.

Supra, pp. 803–806 ad 3193–3200c: In many instances the editors have been unable to give any meaning for a word in a given passage where a probable meaning may be found. In many instances, furthermore, the editors have a question mark after a meaning where the sense is reasonably clear. In addition, the method of separating meanings by a dash to indicate wide differences in significance, by a semicolon to denote nuances within a meaning of wider scope, and by a comma to signify near or similar meanings is unsuccessful. Indeed, numbering meanings, as in LIDDELL-SCOTT-JONES, would have been more effective.

## 26.1: Josephus' Vocabulary: Individual Words

(3203c) DAVID J. LADOUCEUR: The Language of Josephus. To be published in *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, 1982.

(3203e) JOHN G. GIBBS (Moorhead State University, Moorhead, Minnesota): Josephus' Slavery Vocabulary. Awaiting publication.

- (3206a) ARNALDO MOMIGLIANO: Ancient History and the Antiquarian. In: *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13, 1950, pp. 285–313.
- (3207c) PETER STUHLMACHER: *Gerechtigkeit Gottes bei Paulus*. Göttingen 1965; 2nd ed., 1966.

LADOUCEUR (3203c) notes how medical writers may help us to understand Josephus' vocabulary. In particular, he remarks, ἡματωμένον from αἵματώ means not "to become stained with blood," as THACKERAY in his Loeb translation and in his dictionary and as RENGSTORF in his concordance state, as if Josephus were attempting to rationalize the plague, but rather, as Galen (8.379: to this we may add Rufus, *De Renum et Vesicae Affectionibus* 5.2 and Galen 17 [2]. 692) uses it, "to change to blood," a meaning confirmed by Josephus' (Ant. 2.294) description of the plague and by the Septuagint's translation (Exodus 7.20) of the plague. He also notes that αἰώρα (Ant. 8.186) means not "ride," as THACKERAY and RENGSTORF have it, but "passive exercise," as found in the medical writers Antyllus (ap. Oribasius 6.23) and Soranus (1.25: add *Inscriptiones Graecae* 4.955). We may, however, remark that Josephus uses the verb αἰωρούμενος from αἰωρέω, from the same stem as αἰώρα, in the very same section, thus indicating that Solomon was "raised" high in his chariot.

GIBBS (3203e) notes that Josephus is not consistent in his use of the various words for slave and that the words are used without fixed or precise meanings. Moreover, there is no clear distinction between slaves and servants, probably a reflection of the fact that *ʿeved* in Hebrew is used indiscriminately for both. Using Josephus' paraphrase of I Samuel-II Kings as a sample, GIBBS remarks that Josephus generally uses a different word from that found in the Septuagint, even though Josephus almost certainly used a Greek text (though not quite our Septuagint) for this portion of the Bible.

MOMIGLIANO (3206a) notes that by the time of Josephus the word ἀρχαιολογία meant simply "history from the origins" or "archaic history".

STUHLMACHER (3207c), p. 107, comments briefly on Josephus' view of δικαιοσύνη.

Supra, p. 811 ad 3212c: HOMMEL connects the word κορβᾶν with the Tyrian word for caravan, as well as with Aeschylus (Agamemnon 1061, καρβάνω).

- (3214a) T. P. WISEMAN: Josephus on the Palatine (AJ 19.75–6). In: *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 5, 1980, pp. 231–238.
- (3219zf) LUIZ DíEZ MERINO: El suplicio de la cruz en la literatura judía intertestamental. In: *Studii Biblici Franciscani Liber Annuus* 26, 1976, pp. 31–120.

WISEMAN (3214a) says that ἐν τῷ Παλατίῳ (Ant. 19.75) means "on the Palatine" (so Dio 56.46.5, 59.29.4), not "in the palace" (he incorrectly states that I give the latter translation in my Loeb edition). The word καλύβη (Ant. 19.75) refers to the Palatine hut (and not a tent, as RENGSTORF's Concordance has it) at the top of the *Scalae Caci*; in front of it were held the *ludi Palatini*. The word ἐτέρων (Ant. 19.90) refers to another door: WISEMAN thinks that the first two doors were the normal πύργοι at each side of the stage and that the third led out of the back of the stage-building.

DÍEZ MERINO (3219zf), pp. 43–44, simply lists, without comment, the references to crucifixion (σταυρός, etc.) in Josephus.

## 26.4: Josephus' Language and Style

- (3252e) F. LASSERRE: Prose grecque classicisante. In: H. FLASHER, ed., *Le classicisme à Rome aux I<sup>ers</sup> siècles et après J. C.* (Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 25). Vandœuvres–Genève 1979. Pp. 135–173.

LASSERRE (3252e) comments that the Atticizing movement in rhetoric, which extended from Dionysius of Halicarnassus to Josephus and the Book of Acts in the New Testament, employed heterogeneous and ambiguous language, wavering between rigor and the desire to arouse emotions.

## 26.5: Speeches and Letters in Josephus

- (3259g) F. GERALD DOWNING: Ethical Pagan Theism and the Speeches in Acts. In: *New Testament Studies* 27, 1981, pp. 544–563.  
 (3259h) BERNARD THÉRON: Le discours de l'historien dans «La guerre des Juifs» de Flavius Josèphe. Diss., University of Paris 1979.

DOWNING (3259g), on the basis of an analysis of forty speeches of varying lengths in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities', notes a recurrent pattern: a) G-d is powerful and exercises foresight (πρόνοια); b) we must, therefore, be virtuous and obedient, keeping the ancient rules; c) we shall then enjoy the good life; and d) escape the unpleasant alternatives. He analyzes Reuben's speech to his brothers urging them not to kill Joseph (Ant. 2. 20–31, based on Gen. 37. 21–22) and notes that Josephus' version follows the pattern noted above which is not in the Biblical text and which is most characteristic of the dominant themes in Palestinian Judaism of Josephus' time. He notes that a similar pattern is found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1. 4. 5, 5. 56. 1).

THÉRON's (3259h) dissertation, which I have not seen but a summary of which has been supplied to the present writer by the author, concludes, on the basis of a study of Josephus' style in the 'War', and especially of the speeches, that Josephus' work is a philosophical or, more precisely, a theological history which adopts the genre of history only incidentally.

## 26.7: Symbolism, Allegory, and Metaphor in Josephus

- (3266c) CARL R. HOLLADAY: *Theios Aner* in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of this Category in New Testament Christology. Diss., Yale University, New Haven 1974. Publ.: Missoula, Montana 1977.  
 (3266da) W. W. FIELDS: Early and Medieval Jewish Interpretation of the Song of Songs. In: *Grace Theological Journal* 1, 1980, pp. 221–231.

HOLLADAY (3266c), pp. 82–89, remarks that Josephus' symbolic interpretation of the Tabernacle (Ant. 3. 180–187) reflects the Stoic view of νόμος as the expression of the κόσμος. In particular, he notes that in his 'Quaestiones Homericae', Heraclitus, an older contemporary of Josephus, vigorously defends Homer in a manner strikingly similar to that employed here by Josephus, namely through the appeal to allegory, though HOLLADAY notes that whereas Heraclitus uses moral, physical, and historical allegory, Josephus restricts himself to cosmic symbolism. Thus Josephus is able to reinforce his point that Judaism follows not a provincial but a cosmic law code.

FIELDS (3266da) notes the absence of any attempt in Josephus to allegorize the Song of Songs. We may, however, comment that this is hardly significant, since Josephus is, above all, an historian rather than a theologian and that he consequently does not deal with the Song of Songs, let alone systematically.

## 26.9: Josephus' Literary Assistants

(3283c) JOHN G. GIBBS (Moorhead State University, Moorhead, Minnesota): Josephus' Slavery Vocabulary. Awaiting publication.

GIBBS (3283c) notes a shift in the vocabulary referring to slaves in 'Antiquities' 15–20, perhaps, we may suggest, supporting THACKERAY's theory of assistants for this part of the 'Antiquities'. There ἀνδράποδον, ἀνδροπίζω, and θεράπων do not occur at all, whereas the first two are found seven times in Books 1–14 and θεράπων occurs twenty-three times.

## 26.10: Josephus' Grammar

(3286a) F. NEIRYNCK: Ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτόν (Lc 24, 12 et Jn 20, 10). In: Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 54, 1978, pp. 104–118.

(3286b) P. W. VAN DER HORST: Some Late Instances of Inceptive δέ. In: Mnemosyne 32, 1979, pp. 377–379.

NEIRYNCK (3286a) gives sixteen instances of the phrases πρὸς ἑαυτόν and πρὸς ἑαυτοῦς in Josephus (e.g. Ant. 8. 124) and notes that the meaning is "to his (their) own home". It has nothing to do with the ethical dative. We may note that here RENGSTORF's concordance is of no help, since the citations of prepositions give the references without the context, and since for the entry ἑαυτοῦ RENGSTORF has *passim*.

VAN DER HORST (3286b) cites the occurrence of δέ in the opening sentence of Life 1 as an example of its use as a weakened form of δῆ: here Josephus is answering his opponents by a self-assertive counter-attack.



## 26.11: Hebrew as Josephus' Ancestral Language

- (3291e) DAVID GOLDENBERG, rev.: W. C. VAN UNNIK, Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller. Heidelberg 1978. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 70, 1979–80, pp. 178–182.

GOLDENBERG (3291e) cites three phrases in Josephus which he says are Semitic, namely γυμνοὺς δὲ τὰ στέρνα τῶν ἐσθήτων διερρηγμένων = *kōre'a ad sheyegaleh eth lebo* (War 2.322), ἀποθανεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ παραβῆναι = *yeharōg v'al ye'avōr* (Ant. 6.149), and πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον (Ant. 10.11) and ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσωπα κείμενοι = *nafal 'al 'apov* (Ant. 18.27). We may comment that the first is not particularly close and, in any case, is similar to the Septuagint's I Esdras 8.73. The second is a commonplace and, at any rate, is similar to IV Maccabees 16.24, which GOLDENBERG himself cites; and the third is very similar to the Septuagint's frequent phrase (e.g. Gen. 17.3, Lev. 9.24).

## 27.1: Parallels between Josephus and the Talmud

- (3319e) BEN ZION DINUR: The Historiographical Fragments in Talmudic Literature and Their Investigation (in Hebrew). In: *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 1969, Vol. 2, Jerusalem 1972, pp. 137–146.
- (3319f) MOSHE D. HERR: The Conception of History among the Sages (in Hebrew). In: *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, 1973. Vol. 3, Jerusalem 1977, pp. 129–142.

DINUR (3319e) cites parallels between Josephus, War 1.68, and Tosefta, Sotah 23.7; Antiquities 13.372 and Kiddushin 66a; and Antiquities 13.401–404 and Sotah 22b.

HERR (3319f) concludes that the Talmudic corpus does not show the influence of Josephus.

## 27.2: Josephus and Tacitus

- (3331a) PIERPAOLO FORNARO: Flavio Giuseppe, Tacito e l'impero (Bellum Judaicum VI. 284–315; Historiae V, 13). Torino 1980.
- (3331b) MENAHEM STERN: Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism. Vol. 2: From Tacitus to Simplicius. Jerusalem 1980.

I have not seen FORNARO (3331a), which presumably deals with the parallels between Josephus (War 6.284–315) and Tacitus (Histories 5.13) in the description of the portents accompanying the destruction of the Temple.

STERN (3331b), p. 3, compares Tacitus' Histories 5.10–13 with Josephus' 'War'. He concludes that there are some similarities, the most obvious one pertaining to the portents that preceded the great events of the war, above all the prophecy that the world would be ruled by someone from Judea. However, there are important differences also, notably in the number of the besieged (Tacitus, Histories 5.13.3). In addition, Tacitus confuses John of Gischala with

Simon bar Giora and expands on the end of Cestius Gallus (5. 10. 1), a topic with which Josephus does not deal. STERN concludes that Tacitus did not use Josephus directly and that while indirect influence is possible it is by no means a necessary assumption, since Tacitus may have used other sources, notably Pliny the Elder, Antonius Julianus, and the Commentaries of Vespasian and Titus.

## 27.24: Medieval Greek Authors in Eastern Europe

- (3379e) RIVKAH DUKER-FISHMAN: The Works of Josephus as a Source for Byzantine Chronicles. In: A Symposium: Josephus Flavius – Historian of Eretz-Israel in the Hellenistic-Roman Period: Haifa, March 25–26, 1981: Abstracts. The Center for the Study of Eretz Israel and Its Yishuv of Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and University of Haifa 1981. P. 34.

DUKER-FISHMAN (3379e) notes that the Byzantine chronicles differ from one another and from their patristic antecedents in the degree and tendency of their use of Josephus. In particular, she comments on the use of Josephus made by John Malalas in the sixth century, by the 'Chronicon Pascale' in the seventh century, and by George Syncellus in the ninth century, as well as by post-Iconoclastic Byzantine chroniclers.

## 27.25: The Medieval Legend of Josephus the Physician

- (3384c) PETER SCHÄFER: Die Flucht Johanan b. Zakkais aus Jerusalem und die Gründung des 'Lehrhauses' in Jabne. In: HILDEGARD TEMPORINI and WOLFGANG HAASE, edd., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, vol. 19. 2, Berlin 1979, pp. 43–101.

SCHÄFER (3384c) asserts that the rabbinic anecdote about Vespasian's swollen foot (Giṭṭin 56b) had nothing to do with Johanan originally but probably goes back to Josephus, since some of the details in the version in Orosius and Landolfus are more historical than those in the rabbinic Aggadah.

## 27.26: Josephus' Influence on Renaissance Figures (. . .) and in the Reformation and post-Reformation Periods

- (3386a) HANS-GEORG VON MUTIUS: Der Kainiterstammbaum Genesis 4/17–24 in der jüdischen und christlichen Exegese; von den Anfängen bis zum Ende des Mittelalters nach dem Zeugnis des Don Isaak ben Jehuda Abravanel. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des Josephustextes (*Judaistische Texte und Studien*, 7). Hildesheim 1978.

VON MUTIUS (3386a), who has a translation into German and an exposition of ABRABANEL's commentary on Genesis 4. 17–24, remarks that ABRABANEL's evidence for the text of Josephus has been underestimated. He is, however, inconclusive on the question as to where Abrabanel is dependent on Josephus and where he uses Josippon, as well as on the identity of the recension of Josephus which he had.

## 27.27: English Literature: General

Supra, p. 862 ad 3389 (HADAS): An edition of the works of Josephus was among the forty volumes contributed by the clergymen who founded the Collegiate School of Connecticut, now Yale University.

(3393c) TERESA M. KELLEY: Deluge and Buried Treasure in Wordsworth's Arab Dream. In: Notes and Queries 27, 1980, pp. 70–71.

KELLEY (3393c) traces back the Arab dream and its treasure in Book 5 of WILLIAM WORDSWORTH's 'Prelude' to the reference in Josephus (Ant. 1. 70–71) to Sesostris (she means the descendants of Seth), who sought to preserve the knowledge of astronomy from the ravages of fire and flood. She notes that the term 'twofold' which is found in Josephus appears twice in the Arab dream.

## 27.28: The Herod Theme in English Literature

(3397a) NANCY C. PEARSE: Elizabeth Cary, Renaissance Playwright. In: Texas Studies in Literature and Language 18, 1976–77, pp. 601–608.

(3397b) ELAINE BEILIN: Elizabeth Cary and *The Tragedie of Mariam*. In: Papers on Language and Literature 16, 1980, pp. 45–64.

PEARSE (3397a) notes that ELIZABETH CARY, in her play 'The Tragedie of Mariam' (written ca. 1606), based on LODGE's translation of Josephus' 'Antiquities', which is the first full-length original play by a woman in England, is very careful with details, avoiding the anachronisms which are usual in this period. She calls attention to the talk in the play about women's rights and equitable divorce laws and concludes that the sentiments are autobiographical.

BEILIN (3397b), in a much more thorough treatment, though unaware of PEARSE's article, comes to a similar conclusion. She adds that the most significant differences between the play and its source are in LADY CARY's Christian perspective and in her understanding of the character of Mariam (Mariamne), to whom she assigns a considerably more complex psychology than does Josephus. Thus, while Josephus' moral is that the price of disobedience is death, even for so virtuous a person as Mariamne, CARY creates an elaborate mechanism whereby Mariam can be both rebel and virtuous woman, and she converts her death into an allegory of the crucifixion of Jesus.

## 27.34: The Influence of Josephus on Art and Music

Supra, p. 871 ad 3438c: WEITZMANN, p. 21, notes, without further comment, the importance of the 'Sacra Parallela', with its scenes from Josephus' 'War' and 'Antiquities'. He also (p. 24) notes that the Cotton Genesis has two apocryphal scenes from Josephus (Ant. 2. 232–237) pertaining to Thermuthis. He also (p. 52) comments on the Vatican Octateuch, in which Ishmael has hit Isaac so hard that his nose is bleeding, an act which, he says, may be ex-

plained by the passage in Josephus (Ant. 1. 215) in which Sarah expresses fear that Ishmael may do some injury to Isaac.

Supra, p. 871 ad 3438f: DEUTSCH stresses that the influence of the theatre on the iconography of the manuscripts of the 'War' is undeniable.

- (3438g) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: The Destruction of the Second Temple as Reflected by Christian Art (in Hebrew). In: AHARON OPPENHEIMER, URIEL RAPPAPORT, and MENAHEM STERN, ed., *Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period: Abraham Schalit Memorial Volume*. Jerusalem 1980. Pp. 394–414.

SCHRECKENBERG (3438g) surveys the depiction of the fall of Jerusalem on a walrus tusk relief (Northumberland, 700 C.E.), two bookcovers (ninth century), two manuscript miniatures (ca. 1000 and thirteenth century), NICOLAS POUSSIN's seventeenth-century painting 'Conquest of Jerusalem by Titus', two book illustrations of the eighteenth century, the nineteenth-century painting of F. J. HEIM in the spirit of POUSSIN, and the huge nineteenth-century painting by WILHELM VON KAULBACH, all of which (especially the last) incorporate many elements from Josephus' account. SCHRECKENBERG co-ordinates this artistic representation with the representation of this event in literature, especially the poetry of such writers as Prudentius and Paulinus of Nola in the fourth and early fifth centuries, who similarly, for example, describe the land of Israel as a widow.

## 27.36: The Influence of Josippon

- (3457d) ISAAH TISHBY: Rabbi Moses Cordovero as He Appears in the Treatise of Rabbi Mordekhai Dato (in Hebrew). In: ITZHAK BEN-ZVI and MEIR BENAYAHU, ed., *Safed Volume: Studies and Texts on the History of the Jewish Community in Safed from the 14th through the 19th Centuries*. Vol. 2, Jerusalem 1963. Pp. 119–166.

TISHBY (3457d) notes that the sixteenth-century Italian Kabbalist MORDEKHAÏ DATO, in his 'Iggeret HaLebanon', which he publishes here, quotes Josippon by name as his primary source for the Second Temple period. He explains the amazing fact that DATO refers to Herod as king of the Jews and that he does not criticize him by noting that Herod was responsible for rebuilding the Temple. We may suggest that a fruitful line of inquiry would be to trace the influence of DATO's older contemporary AZARIAH DEI ROSSI upon him: both, we may note, had knowledge of and admiration for Philo.

## 28.8: Films

- (3509a) ERNEST K. GANN: *Masada*. New York 1981. Presented on ABC Television. April 5–8, 1981.
- (3509b) TRUDE WEISS-ROSMARIN: *Masada on Television*. In: *Jewish Spectator* 46, Spring 1981, pp. 3–9.

GANN's novel was transformed into an eight-hour, eighteen-million-dollar extravaganza of spectacle, with a clear attempt to see contemporary implications in the story, with the Romans being a composite of the Nazis, the English in Palestine before the emergence of the State Israel, the Americans in Viet Nam, and the present-day Arabs, and with the Jews at Masada defying them all as a kind of Jonestown.

WEISS-ROSMARIN (3509b) decries the liberties with facts taken in the television production.

### 29.1: Desiderata: The Tools for Scholarship in the Field of Hellenistic-Roman Jewish History

(3524b) ROBERT A. KRAFT: Jewish Greek Scriptures and Related Topics. In: *New Testament Studies* 16, 1969–70, pp. 384–396.

KRAFT (3524b), pp. 388–389, reports on the state of major projects pertaining to Josephus, notably the THACKERAY-MARCUS lexicon, which, according to MOEHRING, has not been abandoned and which the Münster Institute, headed by RENGSTORF, has, indeed, pledged to help to complete.

### 29.5: Desiderata: Josephus and the Bible

(3536c) HEINRICH BLOCH: *Die Quellen des Flavious Josephus in seiner Archäologie*. Leipzig 1879; rpt. Wiesbaden 1968.

(3536d) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.

### 29.7: Desiderata: Josephus and Halakhah

(3539a) DAVID GOLDENBERG: *The Halakhah in Josephus and in Tannaitic Literature: A Comparative Study*. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1978.

GOLDENBERG's (3539a) dissertation marks a good beginning toward a comprehensive study.



## Indices

### *I. Index of References*

The numbers after the colons refer to the bibliographical entries in connection or in juxtaposition with which the citations are made. The numbers in *italics* refer to the 'Addenda', pp. 899–975.

#### A. Josephus

##### 1. 'War'

Book 1: 1641, 3281, 3353d, 3533

1. 1: 1568

1. 1–2: 1519

1. 1–30: 124

1. 2: 86, 3230

1. 3: 86, 1623, 3212d, 3212e, 3291b, 3292,  
3295, 3296, 3298a, 3445

1. 6: 1620c

1. 10: 3353e

1. 13–16: 1629

1. 31–33: 1017

1. 31–69: 1001

1. 32: 1563d

1. 33: 1916, 1919

1. 37: 102, 3296

1. 39: 138, 3031g, 3031h

1. 41: 1009d

1. 41–46: 1009e

1. 42–45: *1092mc*

1. 43–44: 1002

1. 50: 138

1. 60: 2067

1. 61: 1092h, 1107c, 1107h

1. 64–65: 2166

1. 65: 86, 1104, 3296

1. 66: 1137

1. 68: *3319e*

1. 68–69: 1967

1. 73: 2074b

1. 75: 1857j

1. 78–80: 1102, 2074b, *2543zl*

1. 86: 3137c

1. 90: *3165a*

1. 90–95: *1138o*

1. 90–98: 1063a

1. 92: 345

1. 92–95: 1130

1. 96: 1138

1. 96–98: 1131

1. 97–99: 1138g

1. 99–100: 1108, 1109

1. 104: 2979a

1. 105: *3165a*

1. 105–106: 1126, 3187

1. 110: 2242s, 2245b, 2246a, 2260

1. 110–112: 2245a, 2271

1. 110–114: 2242i

1. 118: 1857j

1. 121: 1170

1. 130: 3173r

1. 146: 1179, 1182, 1184, 1185, 1717,  
*1719a, 2064, 2064e*

1. 155: 1599g

1. 156: 1092f

1. 157: 1169v

1. 174: 102

1. 180: 1728

1. 187–192: 1169g, 1209b

1. 187–194: *1169sl*

1. 197: 345

1. 199: 843, 844

1. 204: 1599g, 2698a

1. 204–673: 1247

1. 208–209: 1263

1. 208ff.: 1276  
 1. 210–211: 2116  
 1. 211: *1277b*  
 1. 213: 1278  
 1. 229: 1278  
 1. 312–313: 1731b, 2120, 2698a, 3134  
 1. 343: 1266  
 1. 343–357: 2068b  
 1. 347ff.: 3438e  
 1. 364: 1225  
 1. 365: 102  
 1. 378: 102  
 1. 399: 1283  
 1. 401: 1301  
 1. 402: 2988b  
 1. 407: 1292, 2988a  
 1. 414: 2966, 2968c  
 1. 415: 1288b  
 1. 417: 1292  
 1. 419–421: 2980, 2981, 2985, 2986a  
 1. 422: 3162  
 1. 426–427: 1288a  
 1. 435: 1303  
 1. 436: 3242  
 1. 451: 3192a  
 1. 457ff.: 2891f  
 1. 458: 3192a  
 1. 465: 2891f  
 1. 470: 3219t  
 1. 474: 2891h  
 1. 486: 1265d  
 1. 537–540: 1943  
 1. 564: 3291  
 1. 582–585: 2107c  
 1. 601: 2107c  
 1. 641–646: 255c  
 1. 647–656: 1313  
 1. 648–649: 2576  
 1. 648–650: 2089, 2090, 2882  
 1. 648ff.: 2242w  
 1. 648–655: 138  
 1. 656: 1012, *1315a*, 2054h, 3838e  
 1. 656–658: 2969  
 1. 656ff.: 1315  
 1. 657: 100  
 1. 660: 1265d  
 1. 662: 3438e  
 1. 667ff.: 2891f  
 1. 671–673: 2986a  
 2. 56: 2701, 2702, 2705g  
 2. 56–65: 1317  
 2. 57–59: 1316  
 2. 59: 3173c  
 2. 68: 1318  
 2. 95: 3163  
 2. 111: 1275  
 2. 111–114: 2558  
 2. 117: 1373b, 1389g, 1429a, 1946, 2054d  
 2. 117–118: 2705g  
 2. 118: 1164, 2648, 2650, 2677, 2682, 2690e, 2701, 2702, *2702a*, 2705g, 2869  
 2. 119: 2463, 2468  
 2. 119–120: 1169e  
 2. 119ff.: 1818a, 2334c, 2445b  
 2. 119–159: 3338  
 2. 119–161: 84, 2237, 2334d, 2356, 2358, 2363, 2364, 2393, 2512, 2516, 2621  
 2. 119–163: 1883, 1965  
 2. 119–166: 2177, 2208, 2260, 2266, 3277, 3347  
 2. 120: 2491, *2543zm*  
 2. 120–121: 2421, 2429q, 2512  
 2. 122: 1169e, 2889  
 2. 123: 1818a, 1825c, 2425, 2889  
 2. 123ff.: 2429c  
 2. 124: 2344  
 2. 124–129: 1169e  
 2. 125: 2449a, 2637  
 2. 128: 2428, 2429d, 2429p, 2463  
 2. 129: 2395, 2429, 2432, 2436, 2437, 2543r  
 2. 129–130: 2421  
 2. 129–131: 2430  
 2. 130: 2435  
 2. 131–132: 1169e  
 2. 134: 2420, 2889  
 2. 135: 2301, 2445b  
 2. 135–136: 2491  
 2. 136: 2463  
 2. 137: 2419, 2429i  
 2. 137ff.: 1818a  
 2. 138: 2420  
 2. 139–142: 2439, 2503  
 2. 139–143: 2445b  
 2. 140: 2442, 2445a, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2505, 2836  
 2. 141: 2464  
 2. 142: 1959, 2439–2445, 2446, 2448, 2449, 2559a  
 2. 143: 2491, 2889  
 2. 143–144: 2357k  
 2. 145: 2490, 2519
- Book 2: 1771, *2334h*, *2357g*  
 2. 10: 2072  
 2. 14: 1957



2. 145–146: 2543j  
 2. 146: 2889  
 2. 147: 2064e, 2543za  
 2. 147–149: 2543q, 2543zm  
 2. 148: 2429d  
 2. 149: 2543y  
 2. 150: 2889  
 2. 152: 2356, 2357j, 2446, 2490, 2519  
 2. 152–153: 2457, 2458, 2547  
 2. 154: 2463, 2464  
 2. 154–155: 2429a  
 2. 154–158: 2022i, 2395g, 2406, 2406f, 2463, 2543s  
 2. 155: 2405  
 2. 158: 2551  
 2. 159: 2559  
 2. 160: 2429l, 2543r  
 2. 160–161: 2421, 2429k, 2491, 2512, 2532, 2543zm  
 2. 160–166: 3362c  
 2. 161: 102b  
 2. 162: 2245  
 2. 162–163: 2242x, 2242za, 2243, 2286b, 2286c  
 2. 162ff.: 1818a  
 2. 162–166: 2242a  
 2. 163: 1807, 2012b, 2022i  
 2. 163–164: 1635a, 1803l  
 2. 163–166: 2891o  
 2. 164–165: 2315  
 2. 166: 2242c, 2245, 2321  
 2. 168: 1336  
 2. 169: 1399, 1401, 1402  
 2. 169–174: 1390–1398, 2090, 2093  
 2. 169–177: 1398b, 2891h  
 2. 170: 1394  
 2. 174: 1731a  
 2. 175: 3212  
 2. 175–177: 1379, 3367  
 2. 176: 3367  
 2. 180: 1362  
 2. 183: 1337  
 2. 184–187: 142  
 2. 184–203: 1469d  
 2. 192: 1803f  
 2. 192–203: 142  
 2. 193–198: 1910  
 2. 195: 2891m  
 2. 204–214: 1466  
 2. 204–233: 1465  
 2. 215–217: 1169v  
 2. 219: 3010  
 2. 228: 1563h  
 2. 228–229: 2116c  
 2. 232–233: 1373b  
 2. 235: 2616  
 2. 236: 1605, 3330  
 2. 237–238: 2898a  
 2. 241: 2054i, 3219zc  
 2. 247: 1426, 2891e  
 2. 252: 2891e  
 2. 253: 2054i, 2116c, 2616  
 2. 254: 2667, 2669  
 2. 254–257: 2886  
 2. 258–260: 2516, 2559  
 2. 258ff.: 1803u  
 2. 259: 1989  
 2. 259–261: 2429i  
 2. 261: 2022n, 2886  
 2. 261–263: 1984q, 1984s, 1984x, 2022c, 2886, 2891r, 3031a  
 2. 262: 1989, 2886  
 2. 266: 1404  
 2. 266–270: 1404, 2967, 2967a, 2968, 2968i  
 2. 271: 1429, 2891e  
 2. 280: 1596, 1597  
 2. 280–292: 2968i  
 2. 284: 1548  
 2. 285: 119  
 2. 285ff.: 1825b  
 2. 285–290: 1825d  
 2. 293: 1948, 2835  
 2. 303: 102  
 2. 306: 2054e, 2054i, 3219zc  
 2. 308: 2054i, 3219zc  
 2. 321ff.: 3898a  
 2. 322: 3291e  
 2. 340: 3392  
 2. 345–401: 1817, 3258  
 2. 345–404: 3119, 3254  
 2. 351–354: 1620b  
 2. 353: 2898a  
 2. 380–386: 1516  
 2. 390: 2019  
 2. 398: 1488e  
 2. 400: 1587, 2898a  
 2. 408: 2457, 2458  
 2. 409: 1541, 2298  
 2. 421: 2898a  
 2. 425: 2075  
 2. 427: 3001f  
 2. 430: 2075  
 2. 433: 2649, 2677, 2845, 3095  
 2. 433ff.: 2022c  
 2. 433–443: 2664  
 2. 433–448: 2462, 2631a

2. 434: 2027  
 2. 441: 2835  
 2. 441–442: 1902  
 2. 443: 3095  
 2. 444: 119, 2027, 2587, 2588, 2591, 2596,  
 2603, 2653, 2654, 2669, 2677  
 2. 444–448: 2031  
 2. 447: 3095  
 2. 451: 2116c  
 2. 457: 2093h  
 2. 458: 1563b, 1563f, 2977  
 2. 460: 2093h  
 2. 461–465: 1599g  
 2. 463: 2929  
 2. 469–476: 2120c, 3150e  
 2. 478–480: 2977  
 2. 479: 1489, 1491  
 2. 484: 1292  
 2. 486: 102  
 2. 487: 1477  
 2. 487ff.: 553  
 2. 490ff.: 1488  
 2. 499–555: 1057b, 1563h  
 2. 511: 1535  
 2. 517: 2059  
 2. 517–518: 2576  
 2. 544: 1728  
 2. 556: 1563c  
 2. 558: 2116c  
 2. 562–568: 386, 398d, 1550  
 2. 563: 295  
 2. 564: 119, 2587, 2589, 2603, 2653  
 2. 566: 1294, 1904g  
 2. 567: 2448, 2449  
 2. 568: 398a, 2835  
 2. 572: 2949  
 2. 573: 3173a, 3173q  
 2. 573–574: 2971, 2972  
 2. 574: 1536  
 2. 576: 2949  
 2. 576–579: 88  
 2. 577ff.: 401  
 2. 583: 1599e  
 2. 585–589: 1777  
 2. 587: 1620f  
 2. 588: 1599g  
 2. 622: 2699c  
 2. 629: 1536  
 2. 630: 2116c  
 2. 642–643: 2054h  
 2. 651: 119, 2580, 2586, 2587, 2603, 2653

Book 3  
 3. 1–2: 1563h  
 3. 4: 1607  
 3. 8: 1621  
 3. 11: 2448, 2449  
 3. 20–34: 1535  
 3. 35–40: 2945  
 3. 35–58: 2957n  
 3. 36: 2975  
 3. 40: 3173q  
 3. 41–43: 1599e  
 3. 43: 1599  
 3. 52: 1605a, 3001a, 3374e  
 3. 54–58: 1196a, 2942, 2942a  
 3. 59: 1535  
 3. 61: 1536  
 3. 64–69: 1621  
 3. 68: 3156  
 3. 79ff.: 1605a  
 3. 108: 1522  
 3. 118: 1563i  
 3. 141–142: 1563i  
 3. 141–339: 1605e  
 3. 158: 3173m  
 3. 159: 3173m  
 3. 161: 1909b  
 3. 218: 1904a  
 3. 224–236: 1910  
 3. 258–264: 3376  
 3. 269–270: 1602  
 3. 289ff.: 1563i  
 3. 290: 102  
 3. 300–304: 1984e  
 3. 307–315: 1520  
 3. 314–318: 1904j  
 3. 321: 2054i  
 3. 340ff.: 1818b  
 3. 340–391: 2120c, 3150e  
 3. 340–408: 1523  
 3. 341: 102  
 3. 350–354: 1976, 1983, 1984k  
 3. 351–354: 1979  
 3. 352: 1964  
 3. 354: 438f, 1824  
 3. 361ff.: 3253  
 3. 361–382: 2117  
 3. 362–382: 2022i  
 3. 369–377: 3128, 3149  
 3. 371–374: 2119  
 3. 372–374: 1805, 1807  
 3. 374: 2235, 2283  
 3. 381: 404  
 3. 387: 3430

3. 387–391: 3134, 3428, 3429, 3430  
 3. 387–408: 438b  
 3. 391: 404, 3430  
 3. 396: 1818c  
 3. 399–408: 1984k, 2022e, 3380  
 3. 400: 1984f  
 3. 400–401: 102  
 3. 400–402: 426  
 3. 401: 102b  
 3. 446: 3176g  
 3. 447: 3175i  
 3. 458: 1563i  
 3. 460: 102  
 3. 485: 1563i  
 3. 506–508: 2945  
 3. 522–531: 1563e  
 3. 532–542: 3338a  
 3. 587–588: 1599c, 1599i

## Book 4: 1632

4. 1: 1587  
 4. 2–8: 3173k  
 4. 3: 806  
 4. 4–83: 3173m  
 4. 51: 2578  
 4. 54–61: 3173v  
 4. 79: 102  
 4. 79–81: 3134  
 4. 82: 3134  
 4. 85: 1777  
 4. 96: 1620f  
 4. 98–102: 3254  
 4. 126–127: 1904c  
 4. 129–161: 2685  
 4. 135: 2685  
 4. 137: 3219f  
 4. 138: 2685  
 4. 153–157: 1903  
 4. 154: 138  
 4. 155: 2604  
 4. 156–157: 2685  
 4. 159: 1948f  
 4. 160: 2603, 2604  
 4. 161: 138, 2596, 2604  
 4. 170: 3196  
 4. 180–184: 1904c  
 4. 224: 138  
 4. 225: 2605a  
 4. 288: 1731  
 4. 314–318: 1902, 1904c  
 4. 318–325: 2825d  
 4. 319–320: 2819  
 4. 319–321: 1896

4. 335: 1984a, 1984b  
 4. 388: 2617, 2618  
 4. 399–400: 2576  
 4. 402: 3093, 3106, 3150  
 4. 405: 2116c  
 4. 440: 1517a  
 4. 444: 438c  
 4. 450: 1563i  
 4. 460: 102  
 4. 476–485: 3325  
 4. 477: 1614, 2453  
 4. 480: 1803s  
 4. 486: 2453  
 4. 487: 2978  
 4. 487–488: 2977  
 4. 503ff.: 2022c  
 4. 504: 2576  
 4. 510: 100  
 4. 512: 138  
 4. 529–537: 2068  
 4. 530: 688  
 4. 530–533: 1291  
 4. 531: 1291  
 4. 532: 3167  
 4. 538–544: 2705  
 4. 544: 3169  
 4. 550–555: 1563l  
 4. 558: 2698  
 4. 560–563: 2672  
 4. 567: 1512e  
 4. 573: 102  
 4. 574: 1904g  
 4. 575: 2704  
 4. 582: 1297c, 1869e  
 4. 586: 3001  
 4. 602: 3325  
 4. 603–606: 1618  
 4. 618: 3219n  
 4. 623–629: 426  
 4. 656: 102, 3219n  
 4. 697: 3325

## Book 5: 1567, 1620e, 2898b, 3281, 3336

5. 4–5: 3019  
 5. 11: 3196  
 5. 12: 3196  
 5. 24–26: 1169e  
 5. 27: 2048e  
 5. 34: 2048e  
 5. 36–38: 3001g  
 5. 45: 1566  
 5. 47ff.: 1605, 3330  
 5. 136ff.: 138

5. 136–141: 2990  
 5. 140: 3031l, 3392  
 5. 145: 2543q, 3392  
 5. 146: 3014b, 3014h  
 5. 147–148: 3014n  
 5. 147–155: 3007, 3008  
 5. 147–160: 3003  
 5. 151–152: 3010, 3014l  
 5. 152: 3014  
 5. 152–153: 3014l  
 5. 153–157: 3010  
 5. 155: 3014l  
 5. 156–157: 3024  
 5. 163–175: 3031o  
 5. 176–183: 2988b; 3024  
 5. 181: 138  
 5. 182: 3219l  
 5. 184: 3219zb  
 5. 184–220: 1845, 1852  
 5. 184–247: 1830, 1857i, 1868  
 5. 186: 3219zb  
 5. 193–195: 1857p, 1866f, 3219zb  
 5. 194: 255d, 1857b, 1858–1866f, 3216  
 5. 200: 1842  
 5. 201–206: 1896c  
 5. 207–224: 1857p  
 5. 207–227: 1841  
 5. 208: 1844, 1909, 3265  
 5. 208–209: 3219zb  
 5. 211–214: 1857b  
 5. 214: 2093b  
 5. 217: 83, 3339  
 5. 217–218: 3266a  
 5. 219: 1857b  
 5. 222: 3031d  
 5. 222–224: 3001f  
 5. 224: 1842  
 5. 231: 3385  
 5. 234: 1907  
 5. 235: 1766, 1908  
 5. 236: 1909  
 5. 238: 1857o  
 5. 238–245: 3020a  
 5. 238–246: 3015  
 5. 238–247: 3031e  
 5. 245: 1857o  
 5. 247: 138  
 5. 250: 2603  
 5. 252–253: 1512e  
 5. 285: 119  
 5. 289: 2054i  
 5. 299: 3010  
 5. 303–307: 3031n  
 5. 312: 1728  
 5. 345: 2898a  
 5. 348: 3209  
 5. 362–374: 3115  
 5. 362–419: 1984, 3119, 3258  
 5. 363–419: 1817  
 5. 367: 102, 1817  
 5. 376–419: 3115  
 5. 378: 1801  
 5. 384: 3196  
 5. 391–392: 1981  
 5. 393: 3219l  
 5. 394: 1563d  
 5. 419: 1818g, 1818b  
 5. 449: 1569, 2054e, 3219zc  
 5. 449–451: 2054i  
 5. 451: 3219zc  
 5. 462: 102  
 5. 466–472: 3018  
 5. 467: 3018, 3020, 3020a  
 5. 468: 3031e  
 5. 504–505: 3031  
 5. 527: 1904g  
 5. 527–533: 2705  
 5. 555: 138  
 5. 566: 1913, 2890  
 5. 572: 102  
 Book 6: 1567, 2359, 2361a, 2898b, 33  
           3362b, 3543  
 6. 5: 826  
 6. 48: 138  
 6. 96: 3291b  
 6. 114: 1827a  
 6. 123–126: 1866f  
 6. 124: 1861  
 6. 124–126: 1866b, 1866f  
 6. 125: 1858–1866f  
 6. 126: 2054d  
 6. 166–168: 1803s  
 6. 199–212: 1571  
 6. 201–213: 3403  
 6. 211: 102, 1803s  
 6. 236–243: 1620c  
 6. 237: 1488t  
 6. 238: 1580  
 6. 238–266: 1169e  
 6. 241: 1580  
 6. 249ff.: 129a  
 6. 257: 100  
 6. 260–266: 3128, 3149  
 6. 280: 3134, 3226

6. 284–315: 3331a  
 6. 285–287: 1547b, 1984r  
 6. 288–300: 1635a  
 6. 289: 2000c, 2894  
 6. 290: 1984f  
 6. 290–295: 1977  
 6. 291: 1977  
 6. 292: 138, 2894  
 6. 293: 1984f, 2894  
 6. 293–294: 1570  
 6. 296–299: 2894  
 6. 299: 138, 2000a, 2894  
 6. 300: 2818o  
 6. 300–301: 2022c  
 6. 300ff.: 3321  
 6. 300–304: 828  
 6. 300–305: 1803s  
 6. 300–309: 1984c, 1984g, 2818m, 2818n, 2818p  
 6. 300–310: 1635a  
 6. 301: 1958, 2898a  
 6. 304: 3203b  
 6. 306: 3203b  
 6. 309: 3203b  
 6. 310–315: 2016, 2017  
 6. 311: 1959, 1984l  
 6. 311–313: 821, 2617, 2618  
 6. 312: 138, 432, 1620b, 1960, 1963, 2031, 3096  
 6. 312–313: 438a, 824h, 1984k, 1984l, 2031a, 3353e  
 6. 312–315: 1530  
 6. 313: 2022e  
 6. 316: 1098, 1101b  
 6. 322: 1587  
 6. 324–325: 3031i  
 6. 335: 138  
 6. 339: 1588  
 6. 352: 102  
 6. 353: 1587  
 6. 354–355: 3001f  
 6. 355: 1512e  
 6. 386: 138  
 6. 387–391: 1579c, 1620d  
 6. 388: 1620d, 3291a  
 6. 404: 1587  
 6. 413: 138  
 6. 414: 102  
 6. 420: 1595, 1597  
 6. 420ff.: 1596  
 6. 422–426: 1599  
 6. 423: 2072, 2074a  
 6. 425: 1599e, 1825c  
 6. 429–432: 1579c  
 6. 438: 2406e, 3171  
 Book 7: 1635, 3112, 3251, 3540  
 7. 1: 1587  
 7. 20: 138  
 7. 26–36: 2705  
 7. 29: 2704  
 7. 43: 952, 1488e  
 7. 43–46: 1825b  
 7. 45: 1825c, 2100a, 2907  
 7. 46–52: 1616, 1617  
 7. 47–48: 1488m  
 7. 100–111: 1488c  
 7. 103–111: 1615  
 7. 110–111: 1492c  
 7. 123ff.: 1620a  
 7. 130: 138  
 7. 136: 3196  
 7. 143–144: 100  
 7. 148: 1622, 1623, 1628a  
 7. 148–150: 1620d, 1626, 3181  
 7. 149: 102  
 7. 150: 626f  
 7. 151: 3196  
 7. 153–154: 3133  
 7. 162: 626f  
 7. 175: 3036e  
 7. 180–185: 1803s  
 7. 185: 2892  
 7. 190–209: 3034, 3035  
 7. 218: 1169x, 1619, 1866h, 1866k  
 7. 219: 3155a  
 7. 252: 3155a  
 7. 252–406: 138, 3082  
 7. 253: 138, 2677, 3089  
 7. 254–274: 565c  
 7. 256: 3112  
 7. 259: 102  
 7. 259–274: 2569, 2570, 2581, 2642, 2668, 2676, 2677, 2683, 2684, 2690, 2697  
 7. 262: 2668  
 7. 262–274: 2621, 2683, 2684, 2690a, 2699c  
 7. 267: 2911k  
 7. 268: 2596  
 7. 271: 138  
 7. 277: 138  
 7. 280–319: 3112c  
 7. 286: 3112k  
 7. 291: 3043  
 7. 304–401: 2120c, 3150e  
 7. 310: 3126  
 7. 320–388: 2117

7. 321: 138  
 7. 323–336: 354e, 3119a  
 7. 323–388: 3256  
 7. 341–388: 1817, 3119e, 3258  
 7. 341–406: 111  
 7. 344: 2265a  
 7. 352–356: 3338  
 7. 359ff.: 1801  
 7. 372–382: 106  
 7. 387: 3124  
 7. 395: 3124  
 7. 397: 3150  
 7. 399: 3150  
 7. 399–400: 3095  
 7. 401: 3106  
 7. 404: 3098, 3101  
 7. 405: 3112  
 7. 405–406: 3119d, 3132  
 7. 406: 3128, 3149  
 7. 410: 3128, 3149  
 7. 410–416: 1619  
 7. 418–419: 3089, 3112  
 7. 420–432: 1919  
 7. 421–436: 553, 1934a  
 7. 422: 138  
 7. 426: 1917  
 7. 427: 1916  
 7. 431: 1926  
 7. 434: 1635g, 3207b  
 7. 436: 1920  
 7. 437–438: 1494, 2022c  
 7. 437ff.: 2885b  
 7. 445: 1608  
 7. 450: 3133  
 7. 455: 3219l
2. 'Antiquities'  
 Book 1: 632, 3355  
 1–4: 3536b  
 1. 1–17: 1747, 1748  
 1. 1–25: 124  
 1. 4: 3230  
 1. 5: 604, 1646d, 3298a  
 1. 10: 3212d, 3292, 3298a  
 1. 13: 601b  
 1. 14: 1080, 1389, 1785, 2003  
 1. 14–15: 1817  
 1. 15: 1727, 1803i  
 1. 17: 582, 601, 601a, 649, 658, 779, 3292, 3298a  
 1. 18: 2490  
 1. 19–20: 1785
1. 21: 1749  
 1. 22–24: 1727  
 1. 23–24: 2039  
 1. 25: 682, 1653  
 1. 27: 1730, 1783  
 1. 27ff.: 676a  
 1. 27–33: 661g  
 1. 32: 665  
 1. 33: 2064c, 3307  
 1. 34–40: 661g  
 1. 39: 676b  
 1. 41–51: 661g  
 1. 51–66: 661g  
 1. 52: 1747  
 1. 55: 1799  
 1. 70: 667, 676c, 676f  
 1. 70–71: 80, 676d, 3393c, 3418  
 1. 71: 676e  
 1. 72–108: 675a  
 1. 73: 676g, 3342  
 1. 81: 714, 2077  
 1. 85: 676h, 723m  
 1. 86: 676i  
 1. 89–108: 661g  
 1. 93: 809  
 1. 94–95: 1671a  
 1. 96: 1776a  
 1. 100–101: 743  
 1. 107: 809  
 1. 109–121: 661g  
 1. 118: 3196  
 1. 122–147: 661g, 676, 676j  
 1. 123: 676b  
 1. 124: 3419  
 1. 128: 1101, 3386  
 1. 130–142: 625  
 1. 132–133: 676b  
 1. 147: 676k, 3353b  
 1. 148–150: 618  
 1. 148–160: 661g  
 1. 151: 2107f  
 1. 151ff.: 615  
 1. 154ff.: 1803c  
 1. 155: 1798  
 1. 155–156: 678  
 1. 156: 681, 1791, 1792, 1818eb  
 1. 158: 809  
 1. 158–160: 1671a, 1705  
 1. 159: 1703  
 1. 159–160: 1671a  
 1. 161–168: 661g, 1689  
 1. 162: 687  
 1. 164: 687

1. 167: 691a, 1818eb  
 1. 169–185: 661g  
 1. 170: 100  
 1. 177: 1748, 1759  
 1. 179–181: 691b, 691c  
 1. 180: 3171  
 1. 186: 691d, 3169  
 1. 186–193: 661g  
 1. 190: 1747  
 1. 192: 663  
 1. 193: 83, 3339  
 1. 194–206: 661g  
 1. 197: 685  
 1. 200: 685  
 1. 207–212: 661g  
 1. 213–221: 661g  
 1. 215: 3438c  
 1. 218: 1705  
 1. 222–236: 615, 661g, 691e, 691f, 1776a  
 1. 224: 2130  
 1. 228–232: 2265a  
 1. 232: 2021  
 1. 233: 691f  
 1. 237: 1291  
 1. 237–256: 661g  
 1. 238: 83, 3339  
 1. 239: 1705, 1706  
 1. 240–241: 3352  
 1. 257–266: 661g  
 1. 267: 100  
 1. 267–284: 661g  
 1. 272: 1799  
 1. 285–308: 661g  
 1. 309–324: 661g  
 1. 325–336: 661g  
 1. 331: 1014  
 1. 337–346: 661g

## Book 2: 723h

2. 1–8: 661g  
 2. 1–200: 632  
 2. 9–38: 661g  
 2. 20–31: 3259g  
 2. 22: 3253  
 2. 32: 100  
 2. 39: 119  
 2. 39–59: 661g  
 2. 49: 119  
 2. 54–58: 119  
 2. 60–74: 661g  
 2. 73: 697, 3438a  
 2. 75–94: 661g  
 2. 78: 119

2. 91: 119  
 2. 95–113: 661g  
 2. 114–123: 661g  
 2. 124–159: 661g  
 2. 140ff.: 3253  
 2. 150: 618  
 2. 160–167: 661g  
 2. 168–188: 661g  
 2. 189–200: 661g  
 2. 205: 723e  
 2. 205–209: 723g, 2898d, 3319d  
 2. 214: 2054g  
 2. 217–237: 3418  
 2. 224: 3431  
 2. 224–237: 723f  
 2. 232–237: 3438c  
 2. 233: 2021, 3431  
 2. 233–236: 3379b  
 2. 234: 2021  
 2. 238–253: 3367c, 3379b  
 2. 239–253: 723k  
 2. 243–253: 707  
 2. 248: 3203d  
 2. 249: 676b  
 2. 253: 83, 3339  
 2. 264: 3438a  
 2. 275–276: 1803b, 1803q  
 2. 294: 3203c  
 2. 311–317: 2074e  
 2. 312–313: 2074j  
 2. 313: 2064c, 2072, 2074a, 2074c, 3291b  
 2. 316–317: 2074e  
 2. 318: 1776, 3291a  
 2. 324–325: 744q  
 2. 346: 3412  
 2. 347: 723d  
 2. 347–348: 3374d  
 2. 348: 940a, 3369

## Book 3: 723h, 1651b, 2038, 2041

3. 8: 1997  
 3. 23–31: 2000b  
 3. 26: 716  
 3. 26–27: 723a  
 3. 26–32: 715  
 3. 76: 744q  
 3. 81: 2039  
 3. 86: 3203c  
 3. 87: 3219l  
 3. 90: 1803n, 1803q  
 3. 91–92: 1803r  
 3. 94: 663, 3314b  
 3. 96: 723i

3. 113: 2055c  
 3. 134ff.: 1857a  
 3. 143: 663  
 3. 144: 1628a  
 3. 144–146: 1857l  
 3. 150: 618  
 3. 151–158: 1857j  
 3. 156: 3291b  
 3. 163: 2365  
 3. 166–168: 1905  
 3. 168: 1907  
 3. 179–187: *1818eb*  
 3. 180: 705, *705a*, 723i  
 3. 180–187: 3266a, *3266c*  
 3. 181: 1750, 1751  
 3. 181–183: 1844  
 3. 182: 1750, 1751  
 3. 183: 1750, 1751  
 3. 183ff.: 1771a  
 3. 184–187: 1750, 1751, 1844  
 3. 192: 1981  
 3. 194: 3192b  
 3. 194–196: 1847  
 3. 195: 718  
 3. 205: 3314b  
 3. 218: 2299d, 3314b  
 3. 224–286: 2048, 3314b  
 3. 239: 2077  
 3. 245: 2077a  
 3. 248: 1825c, 2055i, 2072, 3291b  
 3. 248–251: 2074e, 2074h, *2074j*  
 3. 252: 3291b, 3291c  
 3. 261–262: 2543zf  
 3. 274: 2048e  
 3. 282: 2107d  
 3. 286: 3314b  
 3. 294: 2072  
 3. 321: 2048e
- Book 4: 721, 1771h, 2038, 2041, *2048r*  
 4. 40–50: 1823  
 4. 67–75: 2048, 3314b  
 4. 73: 2055b, 3212  
 4. 75: 3314b  
 4. 78–82: 720  
 4. 79: 720  
 4. 102ff.: 615  
 4. 104–130: 1984q  
 4. 118: 102a  
 4. 125: 822  
 4. 146: 744j  
 4. 150–151: 618  
 4. 161: 3170
4. 173: *3165a*  
 4. 175: 2107  
 4. 196: 2033, 2054  
 4. 197: 2033  
 4. 198: 1649, 1651b, 3314b  
 4. 199–301: 2048  
 4. 202: 2048b  
 4. 207: 2095  
 4. 212: 1821  
 4. 214: 119  
 4. 218: 1944  
 4. 219: 2053, 2054b  
 4. 224: 2049  
 4. 254: 2106, 2107  
 4. 271: 2114  
 4. 272: 2102, 2103, 2116a  
 4. 273: *2048r*, 3382  
 4. 274–276: 2048i  
 4. 285–286: 2116b  
 4. 302: 3314b  
 4. 302–331: 722  
 4. 303: 3412  
 4. 319: 2048e  
 4. 326: 676h, 723i, *723m*
- Book 5: 613, 721  
 5. 7: 748  
 5. 25: 3291a  
 5. 63: 3173q  
 5. 76–79: 2863  
 5. 80ff.: 750  
 5. 80–87: *2957n*  
 5. 85ff.: 805  
 5. 87: 3173o  
 5. 98: 100  
 5. 145: 3219zd  
 5. 150–151: 618  
 5. 166–169: 3025  
 5. 194: 1862  
 5. 213: 1014  
 5. 227: 83, 3339  
 5. 276–277: 868c  
 5. 277: 1014  
 5. 301: 753  
 5. 304: 749  
 5. 318–337: 753a, 753b
- Book 6  
 6. 4: 780  
 6. 67: 100  
 6. 76: 1803g  
 6. 149: *3291e*  
 6. 150–152: 618



## INDICES: I. REFERENCES

6. 170: 3161  
 6. 180: 100  
 6. 192: 783c  
 6. 230: 3219l  
 6. 244: 3438a  
 6. 271: 783c  
 6. 305: 2048e  
 6. 310: 784, 785  
 6. 312: 1964  
 6. 327: 786  
 6. 335: 3262  
 6. 340–342: 786  
 6. 363: 100

### Book 7

7. 36: 100  
 7. 105: 100  
 7. 148–149: 787  
 7. 149–150: 618  
 7. 287: 100  
 7. 305: 3412  
 7. 306: 3266e  
 7. 311: 119  
 7. 332: 3206  
 7. 380: 1799

### Book 8

8. 30: 3263  
 8. 34: 1803g  
 8. 35ff.: 750  
 8. 35–38: 2957n  
 8. 37: 805, 1854  
 8. 45: 788  
 8. 45–49: 2892  
 8. 46: 1803u, 2022j  
 8. 46–49: 786, 1803s  
 8. 47: 820a  
 8. 61–75: 1857c  
 8. 62: 789, 791, 794  
 8. 72–73: 1857a  
 8. 79–87: 3266d  
 8. 94: 3266e  
 8. 99: 789  
 8. 103: 1857a  
 8. 107: 1803f  
 8. 111–113: 1825  
 8. 111–115: 1803c  
 8. 114: 1803f  
 8. 124: 3286a  
 8. 131: 1803f  
 8. 144–146: 792, 820d, 1671a  
 8. 146: 792  
 8. 147–149: 1671a

8. 150–151: 618  
 8. 153ff.: 3176g  
 8. 158: 820i, 3388f  
 8. 164: 676k, 3342a  
 8. 165: 100  
 8. 165–175: 802  
 8. 186: 3203c  
 8. 195: 2084  
 8. 209: 1779  
 8. 215: 100  
 8. 219–10. 148: 803  
 8. 226: 806  
 8. 244: 100  
 8. 246: 3161  
 8. 269: 100  
 8. 280: 3219d  
 8. 296–297: 2012  
 8. 335: 1789a  
 8. 337: 1789a  
 8. 343: 3438a  
 8. 349ff.: 1983  
 8. 358: 2053  
 8. 409: 3262  
 8. 418–420: 3262

### Book 9

9. 17: 95  
 9. 28: 676h  
 9. 32: 3287  
 9. 39: 100  
 9. 45–94: 2000b  
 9. 149–150: 618  
 9. 205–214: 828c  
 9. 213: 828c  
 9. 217: 3173o  
 9. 222–227: 828b  
 9. 225: 800, 828b  
 9. 227: 820j  
 9. 265–267: 1984d  
 9. 271: 2072  
 9. 271–272: 2074e  
 9. 275: 3173o  
 9. 281: 1984d  
 9. 284: 805  
 9. 285: 805  
 9. 285–286: 820h  
 9. 288–291: 2140

### Book 10

10. 8: 3291b  
 10. 11: 3291e  
 10. 20: 809  
 10. 34: 809

10. 38: 807, 1984a  
 10. 38–39: 1984d  
 10. 60: 1984d  
 10. 70–72: 2073  
 10. 76: 3262  
 10. 78ff.: 828d  
 10. 80: 828e  
 10. 96–102: 811  
 10. 108ff.: 810  
 10. 149–150: 618  
 10. 152: 1875  
 10. 152–153: 1876  
 10. 169: 3219f  
 10. 181–182: 791  
 10. 186–281: 1984k  
 10. 188–281: 824g  
 10. 195: 822, 3356  
 10. 203ff.: 822  
 10. 203–210: 824f, 1984k  
 10. 210: 385f, 822, 823, 824j, 1785, 1984p  
 10. 210ff.: 3356  
 10. 219ff.: 811  
 10. 219–226: 809  
 10. 219–228: 820  
 10. 219–281: 3398  
 10. 220ff.: 810  
 10. 227: 3419  
 10. 232: 3438d  
 10. 246: 824a  
 10. 260: 1987  
 10. 266–281: 824c  
 10. 267: 337, 824h, 1803md  
 10. 269–277: 3353  
 10. 276: 437, 822, 1960, 2022, 3356  
 10. 276–277: 824b  
 10. 277ff.: 1818a  
 10. 277–280: 2275  
 10. 277–281: 2101  
  
 Book 11: 838, 1904h  
 11–14: 3357, 3358  
 11. 6: 827  
 11. 17: 2054e  
 11. 32: 834  
 11. 32–67: 338  
 11. 80–81: 1857b  
 11. 89: 100  
 11. 103: 2054e  
 11. 109–110: 2074e  
 11. 110: 2072  
 11. 118: 2144  
 11. 159: 846  
 11. 159–183: 847, 848, 849  
  
 11. 168: 850  
 11. 179: 850  
 11. 181: 852  
 11. 184: 647  
 11. 203: 3196  
 11. 208: 697  
 11. 229–230: 1823  
 11. 237: 868c  
 11. 240: 868c, 3219y  
 11. 273–283: 866, 3301  
 11. 277–280: 2211  
 11. 281–292: 2081  
 11. 297: 1880, 1881  
 11. 297–301: 852  
 11. 297–345: 2170a  
 11. 297–347: 65, 856, 2140, 2141, 2154a  
 11. 297–12. 236: 842, 1878  
 11. 302: 2144  
 11. 302–303: 142, 2165b  
 11. 302ff.: 2151, 2165a  
 11. 302–325: 2152  
 11. 302–347: 2154, 2170b  
 11. 304ff.: 553  
 11. 304–312: 2139a  
 11. 306: 142  
 11. 306–347: 2165b  
 11. 309–311: 142  
 11. 310ff.: 2164  
 11. 312: 859  
 11. 313–347: 2068b  
 11. 317–339: 161  
 11. 317–345: 65, 934  
 11. 321–326: 2139h  
 11. 321–328: 2139b  
 11. 326: 1776a  
 11. 329–339: 824d, 940b, 3369, 3418  
 11. 331–335: 940c  
 11. 337: 824j  
 11. 340: 142, 2138, 2170f  
 11. 340–344: 2139m  
 11. 340–346: 2139h  
 11. 340–347: 2170j  
 11. 342–344: 142  
 11. 344: 2160, 2161  
  
 Book 12: 170f, 553, 1051b, 3219l  
 12–20: 3379d  
 12. 4: 2062, 2063  
 12. 4–8: 1070c  
 12. 5–6: 1699  
 12. 6: 1700  
 12. 7–8: 1494  
 12. 8: 1488p

12. 9: 1700  
 12. 11–118: 1766, 3244  
 12. 12–118: 946  
 12. 15: 3291b  
 12. 22: 1803j  
 12. 29: 942  
 12. 43: 1882  
 12. 104: 3219b  
 12. 104–109: 944  
 12. 107: 3298a  
 12. 119: 952, 954, 1489  
 12. 119–127: 951  
 12. 120: 2099  
 12. 129–153: 66, 824d, 964  
 12. 131: 960  
 12. 138: 3219i  
 12. 138–139: 142, 1013  
 12. 138ff.: 553, 1014, 1022  
 12. 138–144: 152, 961, 963, 968a, 968d,  
     1039, 1101d  
 12. 138–153: 962, 963, 964, 965, 968f  
 12. 140: 1847  
 12. 140–142: 142  
 12. 142: 3219i  
 12. 143–144: 142  
 12. 144: 966  
 12. 145–146: 152, 967, 1022, 1039  
 12. 147ff.: 1494  
 12. 147–153: 954, 968b, 968c, 968e  
 12. 148–153: 968  
 12. 150: 968g  
 12. 150–152: 1101d  
 12. 154: 971  
 12. 154ff.: 982  
 12. 154–222: 3219i  
 12. 154–236: 66, 969  
 12. 158: 1070c  
 12. 158–236: 983  
 12. 160–222: 983d, 983e  
 12. 160–236: 970  
 12. 169: 973  
 12. 180ff.: 983a  
 12. 224: 1882, 3219i  
 12. 225: 985  
 12. 225–227: 984  
 12. 225–228: 991a  
 12. 226–227: 66, 986, 987, 988, 990, 991  
 12. 227: 986  
 12. 228–233: 977  
 12. 228–234: 978  
 12. 228–236: 3219i  
 12. 230: 979, 3160d  
 12. 230–231: 3159  
 12. 234ff.: 553  
 12. 237–239: 1926  
 12. 237ff.: 1017  
 12. 237–13. 34: 1000  
 12. 238: 1883, 1886  
 12. 238–240: 1885  
 12. 239ff.: 1037  
 12. 240–241: 1031  
 12. 240–13. 300: 1063  
 12. 242–13. 212: 992, 993  
 12. 246–256: 824  
 12. 251ff.: 1022  
 12. 252: 3030, 3031g  
 12. 253: 1803j  
 12. 255: 1009m  
 12. 256: 1731, 2054e  
 12. 257: 1025  
 12. 257–264: 66, 1003, 1016a, 2170j  
 12. 258–261: 2170j  
 12. 258–264: 142, 152, 1039, 2170d  
 12. 261–263: 1016b  
 12. 265: 2891c, 3226b  
 12. 265ff.: 1052  
 12. 270: 1003  
 12. 276–277: 2058  
 12. 279ff.: 581a  
 12. 279–285: 1009b  
 12. 288–289: 997, 998  
 12. 288–292: 1057b  
 12. 293: 1101a  
 12. 293–297: 824d  
 12. 316–325: 2081  
 12. 317–319: 3031h  
 12. 318: 1624, 1848, 1849, 3031g  
 12. 319: 2071a  
 12. 320: 1803j, 3196  
 12. 320–321: 2080  
 12. 322: 958  
 12. 325: 2071a, 2078  
 12. 327–329: 1056a  
 12. 349: 3031h  
 12. 358–359: 998, 1051e  
 12. 360: 2891f  
 12. 362: 3031g, 3031h  
 12. 366–375: 1009d  
 12. 378: 2065  
 12. 385–413: 1888  
 12. 387–388: 1919  
 12. 388: 1916  
 12. 393: 998  
 12. 405: 1003  
 12. 406: 3031g, 3031h  
 12. 408–410: 2242i

12. 414: 1169l, 1904f  
 12. 414–419: 331, 1169h  
 12. 415–419: 1707  
 12. 417: 1206e  
 12. 417–419: 1043  
 12. 419–421: 1352c  
 12. 422: 1057  
  
 Book 13: 170f, 1716b  
 13–14: 1641  
 13–15: 3272  
 13. 4: 996  
 13. 21: 1003  
 13. 38: 2326i  
 13. 46: 3291a  
 13. 48–57: 1106d  
 13. 62ff.: 553  
 13. 62–68: 1488c  
 13. 62–71: 1934  
 13. 62–73: 1919  
 13. 65–68: 1930  
 13. 68: 1797a, 1798  
 13. 72: 1916  
 13. 73: 2165c  
 13. 74–79: 2139g  
 13. 86–119: 1101c  
 13. 106–108: 1065  
 13. 131–132: 1092j  
 13. 139: 1107a  
 13. 161: 1003  
 13. 163: 1003  
 13. 164–170: 66, 984  
 13. 166: 991f  
 13. 166–170: 987, 988, 990  
 13. 171: 1102b, 1813, 1883, 2242z, 2252, 2260  
 13. 171–172: 2390  
 13. 171–173: 1818eb, 1904a, 2207, 2208, 2242a, 2242x, 2266, 2286b, 2315, 2326d, 2512  
 13. 172: 1811, 2286c, 2429d  
 13. 172–173: 1818a  
 13. 173: 1813  
 13. 187: 1060  
 13. 188: 2242a  
 13. 197: 1110, 1111, 1112  
 13. 202: 1003  
 13. 212: 1063  
 13. 214: 1718  
 13. 215–217: 3031h  
 13. 218: 1060  
 13. 222: 1062  
 13. 228: 2068b  
  
 13. 234: 2066, 2067  
 13. 235: 2068  
 13. 247: 1103  
 13. 249: 1092h, 1107c, 1107h  
 13. 255–256: 2170f, 3173t  
 13. 256: 2165c  
 13. 257ff.: 2326i  
 13. 258: 2906  
 13. 259–260: 1204, 1205  
 13. 260ff.: 1106  
 13. 260–265: 152, 1039, 1127  
 13. 262: 1107g, 1163c  
 13. 271: 1062  
 13. 275: 2978, 3173t  
 13. 276: 1104  
 13. 276–281: 2166  
 13. 280: 1137, 3173t  
 13. 280–281: 2170i  
 13. 281: 2166  
 13. 282: 3319b  
 13. 286–287: 1671a  
 13. 288: 1107b, 2314b  
 13. 288–297: 1138m, 2291, 2299d  
 13. 288–298: 2269, 2450, 3319c  
 13. 289–298: 2242a  
 13. 292: 2295  
 13. 293: 2295  
 13. 293ff.: 2286b  
 13. 294: 2048e, 2285, 2286  
 13. 297: 367, 2239, 2242e, 2242x, 2242ze, 2252, 2260, 2272, 2274, 2286a, 2325, 2326a  
 13. 297–298: 2245a  
 13. 298: 2242a, 2263  
 13. 299: 2299b  
 13. 299–300: 1967  
 13. 301: 1058, 1719  
 13. 304–313: 2543zl  
 13. 311–313: 1102  
 13. 311–318: 2480  
 13. 318: 1599f  
 13. 318–319: 1086, 1358e, 1720, 2906  
 13. 319: 1671a, 1719  
 13. 321–322: 1803w  
 13. 321–327: 1138c  
 13. 322: 1138e, 1716e  
 13. 324ff.: 3173s  
 13. 324–327: 1137  
 13. 334: 1136  
 13. 336: 1070h  
 13. 337: 1138e  
 13. 338: 2958  
 13. 344: 1138e

13. 347: 1138e  
 13. 352–355: 1138k  
 13. 355: 1189  
 13. 356: 1189, 1193, 1194, 1195, 3173c  
 13. 363–364: 3110  
 13. 368: 1104  
 13. 371: 1104  
 13. 372: 1128, 1138i, 2077a, 2245a, 2295,  
     2299d, 3319e  
 13. 372–379: 1138o  
 13. 373: 1107d  
 13. 374: 1193, 1194, 1195  
 13. 375–376: 1063a  
 13. 376: 345  
 13. 376–379: 1130  
 13. 379: 345  
 13. 379–383: 1131  
 13. 380: 345, 1138, 1138g, 2054e  
 13. 383: 1132, 1133  
 13. 390–391: 1108, 1109  
 13. 393: 2979a, 3165a  
 13. 393–404: 1126, 3187  
 13. 395: 3176a  
 13. 395–397: 2326i, 3173  
 13. 397: 2946, 2947, 3157  
 13. 398: 1129  
 13. 398–406: 1119  
 13. 399–411: 1135  
 13. 401: 345, 2242a, 2310, 2314a  
 13. 401–404: 3319e  
 13. 402: 345, 2299b  
 13. 405–406: 1120  
 13. 407: 1107a  
 13. 408: 2252  
 13. 410: 2054e  
 13. 411–413: 2318  
  
 Book 14: 170g, 553, 1169k, 1197, 1202,  
     1206, 1206a, 3272, 3387, 3388, 3533  
 14–17: 3272  
 14. 1–2: 3157c  
 14. 7: 1170  
 14. 9: 1668  
 14. 10: 1209c  
 14. 14–21: 3158  
 14. 18: 1110, 1111, 1112, 2946, 2947, 3157  
 14. 19–21: 3158a  
 14. 21: 2072  
 14. 22–24: 1951b, 1998  
 14. 22–25: 1949, 1950, 1951, 1951a  
 14. 25: 2072, 2074a  
 14. 25–28: 926, 2290, 3228  
 14. 28: 3157c  
  
 14. 29: 119  
 14. 33: 3173r  
 14. 35: 1117  
 14. 38–39: 119  
 14. 41: 119  
 14. 41–46: 119  
 14. 44–45: 1131  
 14. 46–47: 119  
 14. 58: 2299d  
 14. 61–74: 1169e  
 14. 63: 3214  
 14. 64: 2064  
 14. 66: 1183, 1188  
 14. 75: 1189  
 14. 77ff.: 1358a  
 14. 79: 1169v  
 14. 91: 119, 1190  
 14. 103: 1192  
 14. 105: 717  
 14. 110: 2907, 2922, 2924, 2928  
 14. 111–118: 1671a  
 14. 115: 1488e, 1825b  
 14. 116: 1494  
 14. 127: 1192  
 14. 127–139: 1169sl  
 14. 128–136: 1169g, 1209b  
 14. 139: 1192  
 14. 144: 843, 844, 1198  
 14. 144–148: 1204, 1205  
 14. 145ff.: 1206f  
 14. 145–148: 152, 1039, 1092n, 1105,  
     1199a, 1200  
 14. 145–149: 1102d  
 14. 155: 1198  
 14. 158–17. 192: 1247  
 14. 159: 2116, 2698a  
 14. 163ff.: 1276  
 14. 163–167: 1263  
 14. 163–184: 1277a  
 14. 168ff.: 2049  
 14. 168–184: 2116  
 14. 169: 1277b, 2898a  
 14. 170: 1277b, 2049  
 14. 172–174: 1952, 1954, 1955  
 14. 180: 1278  
 14. 188: 1471, 1472, 1477, 1488f  
 14. 190ff.: 1206e  
 14. 190–264: 1206i  
 14. 196–198: 1198  
 14. 200–201: 1198  
 14. 202–210: 1092h, 1127  
 14. 207–210: 1198  
 14. 213ff.: 1169v

14. 213–216: 2083  
 14. 215: 1825c  
 14. 228–229: 1605d  
 14. 229: 1203, 1728  
 14. 230: 1201  
 14. 233: 152, 1039, 1206h  
 14. 235: 1201, 1492f  
 14. 238: 1728  
 14. 238–239: 1203  
 14. 238–240: 1605d  
 14. 247–248: 1201  
 14. 247ff.: 1106  
 14. 247–255: 152, 1039, 1204, 1205  
 14. 258: 1825b, 1825c  
 14. 259–261: 1492f, 1930  
 14. 259ff.: 1168  
 14. 260: 1825b  
 14. 284: 1278  
 14. 306–308: 1169e  
 14. 314–318: 1599g  
 14. 317: 3291a  
 14. 367: 2117  
 14. 386–389: 2049  
 14. 389: 1267  
 14. 429–430: 1731b, 2120, 2698a, 3134  
 14. 447: 1307c  
 14. 455: 1311  
 14. 465: 1266  
 14. 465–491: 2068b  
 14. 468ff.: 3438e  
 14. 475: 2068b  
 14. 479: 1238  
 14. 487: 1177, 1178, 1179, 1182, 1184,  
 1185, 1275a, 1717, 1719a, 2068  
  
 Book 15: 170g, 1641, 3272  
 15–16: 1641, 3196, 3260, 3268, 3280  
 15–17: 1641, 1713  
 15–19: 2364  
 15–20: 1872, 3283c  
 15. 3: 1952–1957, 2898a  
 15. 3–4: 372  
 15. 7: 2068b  
 15. 12–13: 2117  
 15. 23–246: 1306  
 15. 31: 1302  
 15. 50–56: 2988a, 2988b  
 15. 90: 1070a  
 15. 92: 2886  
 15. 97–103: 1307a–h  
 15. 121–122: 2452, 2453  
 15. 136: 1969, 1971  
 15. 139–140: 100  
  
 15. 228–231: 1302c  
 15. 252–260: 1265d  
 15. 253: 2100e  
 15. 259–260: 2107g  
 15. 267–279: 2093f  
 15. 292: 3031e  
 15. 294: 3173e, 3192a  
 15. 299–316: 2986b  
 15. 318: 2988b  
 15. 323–325: 2981, 2985, 2986a  
 15. 331: 2968l  
 15. 333–334: 100  
 15. 334: 2965  
 15. 339: 2966, 2968c  
 15. 341: 1288b  
 15. 343: 1322  
 15. 344: 3163  
 15. 369: 2655  
 15. 370: 372, 1276, 1952–1957, 2301  
 15. 371: 1810, 1818a, 2211, 2301, 2389,  
 2403  
 15. 372: 2393, 2416  
 15. 373: 2393  
 15. 373–378: 119, 2460, 2461  
 15. 373–379: 2334a  
 15. 374–378: 1958  
 15. 376: 2450  
 15. 378: 2450  
 15. 380: 1301  
 15. 385–387: 824b  
 15. 391–395: 1857p  
 15. 391–420: 1868  
 15. 394: 1848, 1849  
 15. 399: 1857h  
 15. 408: 3291a  
 15. 410: 1869a, 1869e, 3001, 3014d, 3031i  
 15.410–411: 1857q  
 15. 410–415: 1297, 2999  
 15. 410–420: 1852  
 15. 412: 3001f  
 15. 414: 1855, 3001f, 3031d  
 15. 417: 1857b, 1857p, 1858–1866f  
 15. 420–421: 1301  
 15. 424–425: 3031e  
  
 Book 16: 1206, 3387, 3388  
 16. 1: 2116a  
 16. 1–5: 2107d, 2109, 2111, 2116d  
 16. 3: 2110  
 16. 136–141: 1288b  
 16. 143–145: 1292  
 16. 149: 1288a  
 16. 160: 1493

16. 162ff.: 1169v, 1231  
 16. 162–165: 76a, 1359  
 16. 162–173: 1206i  
 16. 163: 691b, 2057, 2064d, 3259a  
 16. 163–164: 2116c  
 16. 164: 1825b, 1825c, 3218a  
 16. 166: 76a  
 16. 166ff.: 1206f  
 16. 167–168: 76a, 2116c  
 16. 169: 1493  
 16. 169–170: 76a  
 16. 171: 76a, 2009aa  
 16. 172–173: 76a  
 16. 179: 1107c  
 16. 179–187: 1716e  
 16. 183–186: 1668  
 16. 187: 1508  
 16. 290: 1284  
 16. 294: 2975  
 16. 294–295: 3158b  
 16. 325: 1327  
 16. 356ff.: 1302b  
 16. 367–372: 1302c  
 16. 395–404: 1713  
 16. 396–404: 3262
- Book 17  
 17–19: 2707, 3196, 3268, 3277, 3279, 3280  
 17. 15: 1338, 1339  
 17. 23: 3192a  
 17. 23–31: 1285–1288  
 17. 24–27: 626g  
 17. 28: 1272, 1502  
 17. 32ff.: 2022e  
 17. 41–43: 2242a  
 17. 41–45: 2242f, 2257  
 17. 42: 2242j, 2300, 2301, 2313, 2873e  
 17. 50: 100  
 17. 78: 1890  
 17. 89–145: 1302c  
 17. 113: 2072  
 17. 146: 2107c  
 17. 146–170: 1313  
 17. 149: 2882  
 17. 149–154: 2090  
 17. 151: 2089, 2882  
 17. 157: 2882  
 17. 163: 2116c  
 17. 164: 1879, 1890, 2092  
 17. 167: 2000c  
 17. 168–169: 1315a, 3438e  
 17. 168–170: 1315a  
 17. 168ff.: 1315
17. 169: 1012, 2054h  
 17. 175: 1265d  
 17. 182–187: 1302c  
 17. 183–184: 3438e  
 17. 191: 1267  
 17. 194–195: 2891f  
 17. 219: 1957  
 17. 265: 100  
 17. 271: 2701, 2702  
 17. 271–272: 2022c, 2690e, 2705g  
 17. 271–284: 1317  
 17. 273–276: 2022c  
 17. 273–277: 1316  
 17. 277: 3173c  
 17. 278: 1317  
 17. 278–281: 2022k  
 17. 278–284: 2022c  
 17. 288: 1318  
 17. 295: 2054i  
 17. 314: 1169n  
 17. 317: 2891m  
 17. 339: 1890  
 17. 340: 2987  
 17. 342: 1275  
 17. 343: 1329  
 17. 345–348: 2558  
 17. 345–354: 1975  
 17. 347: 100  
 17. 355: 2845  
 17. 355–18. 2: 2840
- Book 18: 87g, 1375, 2364, 2791, 3249  
 18. 1: 68, 2854  
 18. 1–2: 2054d, 2838–2873  
 18. 1–10: 2682  
 18. 1–25: 3243  
 18. 2: 1373b, 1429a  
 18. 2–3: 2863  
 18. 3: 1890, 2846, 2863  
 18. 4: 2172, 2649, 2675, 2677, 2701  
 18. 4–5: 2690e  
 18. 4ff.: 2655, 2869  
 18. 4–10: 565c, 1547k, 2701, 2702  
 18. 6–9: 2004  
 18. 8: 2898a  
 18. 9: 2648  
 18. 9–10: 2675  
 18. 11: 1102b, 2182, 2208, 2242e, 2242m, 2252, 2260, 2265, 2390, 2415  
 18. 11ff.: 2445b  
 18. 11–25: 2176, 2177, 2208, 2266, 3277  
 18. 12: 2421  
 18. 12–15: 2230, 2242a, 2242zd, 2284

18. 12–17: 68, 2227, 2242f, 2242i, 2891o  
 18. 13: 1811  
 18. 14: 1807, 2235, 2283  
 18. 15: 385, 2041, 2045, 2210n, 2242a, 2242u, 2248, 2263, 2264, 2310, 2314a  
 18. 16: 2252, 2321, 2324, 2325  
 18. 17: 385, 2211, 2242c, 2263, 2298, 2317  
 18. 18: 2242u, 2406f, 2507  
 18. 18–19: 2446  
 18. 18–22: 68, 2334, 2358, 2363, 2364, 2507, 2512  
 18. 19: 1883, 2163, 2334, 2369, 2395, 2407, 2409, 2410, 2411, 2412, 2413, 2417, 2418a–g, 2421, 2428, 2438, 2463, 2491, 3150  
 18. 20: 2334, 2341, 2476a, 2489, 2543zm  
 18. 21: 2424, 2426, 2429k, 2429q, 2512  
 18. 22: 2392a, 2436, 2470–2476a  
 18. 23: 232, 1164, 1803mc, 2334, 2571, 2648, 2650, 2665, 2677, 2690a, 2690e, 2691, 2702a  
 18. 23–24: 2576  
 18. 23–25: 68, 2641, 2701, 2702, 2705g, 3089  
 18. 26: 1890  
 18. 26ff.: 68, 1870  
 18. 28: 3163  
 18. 29–30: 68, 2124, 2167  
 18. 31–35: 68, 1367  
 18. 35: 1366c  
 18. 36: 3158d  
 18. 36–38: 3243  
 18. 37: 2697, 2699c  
 18. 38: 2055f  
 18. 39–43: 1350, 2364  
 18. 39–52: 68, 1341  
 18. 39–54: 3247  
 18. 48: 1346  
 18. 55ff.: 1389c  
 18. 55–59: 68, 1390–1398c, 1743, 2090, 2093  
 18. 55–89: 3243  
 18. 60–62: 68, 1374, 1379, 1398b, 3367  
 18. 61: 3367  
 18. 63: 2018, 2022c, 2022j, 2788  
 18. 63–64: 42, 68, 255b, 352, 449, 452, 485, 503, 1151, 1646, 2544, 2632, 2720j, 2721–2818la, 3326, 3363, 3365, 3427a, 3544  
 18. 64: 2806, 2807, 2808, 3203  
 18. 65ff.: 1364  
 18. 65–80: 2100c, 2100d, 2364, 2724a, 2800a, 3333a, 3418  
 18. 65–84: 68, 1360  
 18. 66–80: 142, 3249, 3277, 3278  
 18. 66–84: 2177  
 18. 69ff.: 1366b  
 18. 81ff.: 1366b  
 18. 81–84: 385c, 1169e, 1169v, 2765, 2800a, 2909, 3249, 3278  
 18. 85: 1984v  
 18. 85–87: 68, 2124, 2168, 2169, 2800  
 18. 85ff.: 1389a, 2885b  
 18. 85–89: 68, 1374, 2022c, 2139k  
 18. 89: 1416  
 18. 89–90: 1383  
 18. 90–124: 3243  
 18. 94: 3291a  
 18. 96–100: 1347  
 18. 97: 1358f  
 18. 101–102: 1343, 1348, 1349, 3335  
 18. 101–105: 1334  
 18. 110: 1272, 2707  
 18. 111: 3032  
 18. 112: 1340  
 18. 116: 3219f  
 18. 116–119: 68, 1984e, 2706–2720w  
 18. 117: 1825f, 2429i, 2712, 2719, 2720g  
 18. 118: 2707, 2720s, 2891m  
 18. 122: 2891h  
 18. 130: 1270, 3226c  
 18. 133: 1270  
 18. 136: 1270, 2107g  
 18. 142: 1272  
 18. 143ff.: 68, 1430  
 18. 145: 1434  
 18. 146: 2100e  
 18. 147: 1434  
 18. 158: 1432  
 18. 159: 1440  
 18. 163: 2891h  
 18. 167: 92, 93, 1366b, 2107c  
 18. 168: 3241  
 18. 169–178: 1366a  
 18. 170: 1366c  
 18. 174–175: 1366c  
 18. 177: 1366c  
 18. 179: 1361  
 18. 201: 100  
 18. 224: 1362  
 18. 237: 1416, 1418, 1420, 1435, 2886  
 18. 245–246: 2832  
 18. 249: 3291a  
 18. 250: 1335  
 18. 252: 1337  
 18. 257: 1744



18. 257ff.: 68, 1445  
 18. 257–260: 1744  
 18. 259–260: 1736  
 18. 261–309: 1469d  
 18. 261–310: 1450  
 18. 271: 3291e  
 18. 282: 2009aa  
 18. 289ff.: 1434  
 18. 294–297: 3259  
 18. 307: 3291a  
 18. 310–373: 1352a  
 18. 310–379: 1287, 1353–1358  
 18. 312: 1866h, 1866k, 2418g  
 18. 314: 1358, 3303, 3304  
 18. 343: 87, 1357, 3302  
 18. 374: 1350
- Book 19: 581e, 1446, 1465, 1466, 3533  
 19. 1–273: 1466, 1469d  
 19. 11: 3196  
 19. 30: 100  
 19. 32–36: 2101b  
 19. 52: 100  
 19. 68–69: 1668  
 19. 71: 1449  
 19. 75: 3214a  
 19. 90: 3214a  
 19. 91: 1467  
 19. 91–92: 1451–1457, 1459  
 19. 104: 1789h  
 19. 106–108: 1668  
 19. 212: 100  
 19. 218: 100  
 19. 251: 1452  
 19. 251–252: 1463  
 19. 252: 1462  
 19. 266: 1169w  
 19. 268: 1169w  
 19. 273: 1169w  
 19. 275: 2886  
 19. 276: 1442  
 19. 277: 1441  
 19. 278: 1488d  
 19. 278ff.: 1469a  
 19. 279: 1488d  
 19. 280ff.: 1169v, 1488i, 1488j, 1488n  
 19. 280–285: 68, 1470–1488s  
 19. 280–291: 1483  
 19. 281: 1471, 1479, 1480, 1482  
 19. 283: 1471  
 19. 286–289: 1206f  
 19. 290: 1488m  
 19. 294: 1435, 2082, 3189
19. 297: 1901  
 19. 299–311: 1825b  
 19. 300: 1825d  
 19. 326: 3010  
 19. 326–327: 3007, 3008  
 19. 331ff.: 2898a  
 19. 332–334: 1444d  
 19. 335: 1436, 3174  
 19. 345: 1437  
 19. 346–350: 1443  
 19. 356–359: 1444  
 19. 357: 2089  
 19. 365: 119
- Book 20: 1642, 2027, 3280  
 20. 3–4: 1469a  
 20. 5: 1469a  
 20. 14: 385c  
 20. 17–90: 1357  
 20. 17–91: 1512  
 20. 17–96: 68, 1352a, 1512a, 2912–2918c, 3302  
 20. 20: 1509  
 20. 22: 1510, 3190  
 20. 34–35: 1169e  
 20. 40–42: 2913  
 20. 43: 2913  
 20. 47ff.: 2022c  
 20. 49–53: 1169e  
 20. 63–65: 1351  
 20. 66–67: 100  
 20. 67: 1512  
 20. 68: 1857j  
 20. 69–74: 1352  
 20. 74: 3191  
 20. 75–76: 1169e  
 20. 90: 100, 1357, 1797, 1797a, 1798, 1823, 3302, 3307a  
 20. 92–95: 1169e  
 20. 95: 1512d, 3021  
 20. 97: 1803u, 1989, 2885b  
 20. 97–98: 1469a, 1984v, 2014, 2022n, 2711, 2874–2885a  
 20. 97–99: 1984x, 2885c  
 20. 100: 1423, 1488t  
 20. 100–101: 2891b  
 20. 101: 1429b  
 20. 102: 2874  
 20. 104: 1272, 1495  
 20. 117: 121, 1425  
 20. 118–124: 1373b  
 20. 121: 2616  
 20. 122: 119

20. 123: 1587, 3203d  
 20. 129: 2054i  
 20. 137: 1426, 1429d, 2891e  
 20. 145: 1498  
 20. 152: 1515  
 20. 154: 1513, 1517, 3247  
 20. 154–157: 3247  
 20. 161: 2616  
 20. 167–171: 2022c  
 20. 168–171: 1984v  
 20. 168–172: 1984x  
 20. 169: 119, 1968, 2022n, 2885b  
 20. 169–172: 1984q, 1984s, 2886, 2891r, 3031a  
 20. 170: 1989  
 20. 171: 119  
 20. 173: 1404, 2968i  
 20. 173–178: 1404, 2967, 2967a, 2968, 2968i  
 20. 176: 119  
 20. 182: 1429b, 2891e, 2891g  
 20. 182–184: 2968i  
 20. 183: 1515, 2968i  
 20. 185–188: 1429  
 20. 186: 2593  
 20. 188: 1803u  
 20. 195: 382, 1169v  
 20. 195–196: 1169e  
 20. 197ff.: 1904c  
 20. 197–203: 1948i, 2825c, 2825q  
 20. 199: 1896, 2286, 2323, 2819  
 20. 199–203: 1942  
 20. 200: 2022j, 2317, 2739, 2774v, 2774zd, 2774zf, 2788, 2818b, 2819–2825s  
 20. 200–203: 1373b, 1946, 1948e  
 20. 202: 1948f  
 20. 204: 2593  
 20. 208: 2593  
 20. 210: 2116c  
 20. 216–218: 1827b, 1948i  
 20. 218: 1891  
 20. 219–220: 3001g  
 20. 224–251: 68, 1870, 1872, 1874  
 20. 231: 1875, 1876  
 20. 234: 119, 1058  
 20. 235: 1888, 1889  
 20. 235–236: 1927  
 20. 237: 1904i  
 20. 250: 1587  
 20. 251: 119  
 20. 256: 1563f  
 20. 258: 1636  
 20. 259: 1637  
 20. 259–266: 1636  
 20. 262–265: 3227, 3231, 3232  
 20. 263: 100, 101, 375, 1455, 3227, 3228  
 20. 264: 926, 933k, 3116, 3227, 3228, 3229, 3230, 3231, 3235  
 20. 265: 3117  
 20. 266: 1500, 1636, 1646a, 1649  
 20. 266–267: 3314a  
 20. 267: 782, 1500, 1508, 1636, 1637, 1646a, 1649, 1651a  
 20. 267–268: 1636  
 20. 268: 1651b, 1653, 1783, 1813, 2038  
 20. 313: 2074c  
 3. 'Life': 170e, 1636–1646c, 3281, 3475  
 1ff.: 385e  
 2: 377  
 6: 377, 378  
 8: 380  
 9: 385a, 385c, 2242o, 2891m  
 9–12: 2338  
 10: 100, 2512  
 10–12: 382, 1783  
 11: 384, 385c, 1771, 2429i, 2512  
 11–12: 2759, 2760  
 12: 383, 417, 604, 1810, 1993, 2011, 2022c, 2211, 2242i, 2275, 2321, 2389, 2710, 3128, 3149  
 13: 382, 385c  
 14–15: 2833  
 16: 1169e, 2922  
 17: 386  
 17ff.: 398a  
 21: 2669  
 28: 386  
 30: 1535  
 38: 1535  
 43: 2705g  
 54: 2160  
 65: 2089  
 72: 404  
 74: 96  
 104: 403a, 1535  
 111: 403a  
 113: 2100  
 115–119: 3173e, 3173h  
 116ff.: 393  
 124: 1535  
 136: 1563a  
 153: 100  
 161–162: 2064

170–173: 2054h  
 177: 1563a, 2054h  
 177–178: 1641  
 186: 1641  
 187: 3173k  
 187–188: 2971, 2972  
 188: 2949, 3173q  
 193ff.: 2819  
 196–198: 2695a  
 208: 100  
 208–209: 2891  
 217–218: 3256  
 232: 1535  
 235: 1599c, 1599e, 1599i  
 256: 2054  
 277: 1825d  
 277ff.: 1825b  
 290ff.: 1825b  
 290–303: 403  
 341–343: 450  
 342: 1519, 1633, 1635i, 3325  
 346–348: 1535  
 356: 445  
 358: 450, 580, 1098, 1519, 1633, 1635i,  
 1697, 3325  
 359: 1498, 1634, 1636  
 359–360: 445, 1498, 1633  
 361: 400, 1634  
 361–362: 3112  
 364–367: 3259d  
 365: 400, 439  
 366: 1459  
 373–380: 1535  
 378–380: 403a  
 381: 2697  
 394–396: 403a, 1535  
 410: 450  
 411: 1535  
 414: 2055, 2055d, 3219r, 3307b  
 414–415: 2107g  
 418: 626f, 652  
 419: 3219r  
 420: 2054e  
 422: 119  
 423: 119, 3112j  
 424: 1494, 1608, 3112, 3112j  
 426–428: 2107g  
 430: 1636, 3314a

4. 'Against Apion': 170d, 206b, 371b, 1071,  
 1075, 1076, 1077, 1078, 1079, 1084f, 1084g,  
 1084h, 1084ia, 1646d–1647k, 1703b,  
 1771f, 1771k, 1771l, 1857p, 2891m,  
 3219q, 3350d, 3388g, 3475

## Book 1

1. 1: 601b, 2891n  
 1. 3: 1646d  
 1. 7: 1827a  
 1. 12: 3204  
 1. 29: 1647i  
 1. 30–31: 378  
 1. 31: 2055  
 1. 33: 2055  
 1. 35: 2055  
 1. 37–40: 644, 661a  
 1. 37–42: 661d  
 1. 38: 661c  
 1. 38–41: 660  
 1. 38–42: 650  
 1. 40: 645, 647, 654, 657, 839  
 1. 40–41: 1984e  
 1. 41: 661b  
 1. 42: 595, 601, 601f, 644, 645, 648, 649,  
 656  
 1. 43: 601  
 1. 48: 2697, 2699c  
 1. 50: 1098, 1519, 1639, 1642, 2445, 3112,  
 3119, 3233, 3267, 3272, 3298a  
 1. 50–51: 1634  
 1. 53: 3112  
 1. 56: 450, 1635i  
 1. 60: 3388g  
 1. 73–82: 744a  
 1. 73–90: 744d, 1671a  
 1. 73–92: 724  
 1. 73–105: 744h  
 1. 78: 734  
 1. 82: 739  
 1. 82–83: 729  
 1. 83: 3196  
 1. 94–103: 85, 3351  
 1. 103ff.: 3354a  
 1. 105: 728  
 1. 108: 794  
 1. 110: 789  
 1. 112–115: 1671a  
 1. 113–204: 1703  
 1. 116–126: 1671a  
 1. 117–120: 789, 792  
 1. 117–125: 820d  
 1. 117–126: 85, 793, 795, 3351

1. 118–119: 2100e  
 1. 119: 792, 797  
 1. 120: 789  
 1. 126: 789, 794, 820d  
 1. 128ff.: 744a  
 1. 128–153: 1703e  
 1. 129–153: 809  
 1. 134–144: 820  
 1. 135: 811  
 1. 135–136: 809  
 1. 135ff: 810  
 1. 139: 99  
 1. 144: 3419  
 1. 150: 818  
 1. 164–165: 1671a, 1676a  
 1. 166–167: 3212b  
 1. 167: 3212, 3212a  
 1. 168–174: 1647g  
 1. 172–174: 1671g  
 1. 173: 1691  
 1. 176–182: 1671a  
 1. 176–183: 3388e  
 1. 179: 3226a, 3388e, 3417  
 1. 183–204: 1691, 1694, 1703c  
 1. 186: 1699  
 1. 186–189: 2063  
 1. 186–205: 1070g  
 1. 187: 1070g, 1698, 1904g  
 1. 187–189: 1827c  
 1. 188: 1688  
 1. 189: 1825b  
 1. 194: 919p  
 1. 197: 1596  
 1. 201–204: 1694  
 1. 205–212: 1671a  
 1. 210: 2062  
 1. 216: 1705  
 1. 217: 1703f  
 1. 218: 1707  
 1. 227–266: 733  
 1. 227–277: 744b  
 1. 227–2. 32: 744h  
 1. 228ff.: 1169v  
 1. 229–251: 1671a  
 1. 231: 743  
 1. 236: 99  
 1. 237: 728  
 1. 250–251: 1934  
 1. 288–292: 1647k  
 1. 288–303: 1671a  
 1. 304–320: 1671a  
 1. 307: 99
- Book 2: 1651b, 1771i, 2054, 3281  
 2. 1: 2891n  
 2. 2–144: 1671a  
 2. 10: 1825b, 1825c  
 2. 10–11: 1934  
 2. 17: 708  
 2. 17–21: 2009c  
 2. 21: 1825c, 3219  
 2. 23: 99  
 2. 26: 2055c  
 2. 27: 3219  
 2. 33: 1488e  
 2. 37: 1488f  
 2. 39: 952, 1825c  
 2. 42: 1488e  
 2. 43: 1690, 1691  
 2. 44: 1494  
 2. 45: 1703f  
 2. 49: 3222  
 2. 49–55: 1064  
 2. 51–55: 1066, 1067, 1068  
 2. 51–113: 76  
 2. 72: 1488e  
 2. 75: 2093a, 2093b  
 2. 77: 1910  
 2. 79ff.: 1169v  
 2. 80: 1082, 1083, 1084  
 2. 80–114: 1084c  
 2. 90: 1082, 1083, 1084  
 2. 103–109: 1857b  
 2. 108: 2891c  
 2. 112–114: 1084, 1671a, 1803e  
 2. 123: 1084a, 1084b  
 2. 131: 99  
 2. 145–150: 1671a  
 2. 145–187: 1649  
 2. 145–295: 111, 1647a, 1647f, 1782, 1789, 1827  
 2. 148: 691h, 1647c  
 2. 154: 2490  
 2. 154–155: 3388g  
 2. 155: 1458  
 2. 164–166: 2009a, 3388g  
 2. 165: 2007  
 2. 168: 1803i, 1803m  
 2. 169: 1084a, 1084b  
 2. 170–178: 2009d  
 2. 173: 744j  
 2. 175: 2064b  
 2. 180: 1649  
 2. 188–189: 1789h  
 2. 188–192: 1649  
 2. 190: 1771b

- 2. 190ff.: 2911d
- 2. 190–210: 1647
- 2. 190–219: 1770o, 2048m
- 2. 193: 1771e
- 2. 193–194: 1827
- 2. 193–198: 1910
- 2. 197: 1649, 1819
- 2. 199: 2105
- 2. 200: 2105
- 2. 202: 2105
- 2. 203: 1767, 1768
- 2. 204–218: 106
- 2. 205: 1767, 1768, 2055
- 2. 207: 2051
- 2. 208: 2108
- 2. 209–210: 2903
- 2. 210: 2911k
- 2. 213: 1767, 1768, 1770, 2121
- 2. 214: 2122
- 2. 215: 99
- 2. 216: 2108
- 2. 218: 1807, 2283
- 2. 233: 98
- 2. 237: 2095
- 2. 242: 3196
- 2. 259–260: 986
- 2. 261: 2911k
- 2. 266–267: 1789h
- 2. 271: 2122
- 2. 278: 379
- 2. 281–284: 2918c
- 2. 282: 1185
- 2. 291–295: 106

### B. Ancient and Medieval Versions of Josephus

- 1. Hegesippus: 176–186b, 354b, 2361, 2821, 2822, 2825a–g, 3353e, 3357, 3379a, 3388e, 3405, 3526, 3544
  - 1. 41.9: 184
  - 2. 12.1: 2800a
  - 2. 22: 184
  - 2. 36.2: 184
  - 3: 185
  - 3. 15–18: 3430
- 2. The Latin Translation Ascribed to Cassiodorus: 187–206b, 3367a, 3367b, 3370a, 3374a, 3374b, 3374c, 3438d, 3526
- 3. The Slavonic Version of the 'War': 206d, 207–262, 287b, 3379b, 3440–3444, 3526, 3526a, 3548
  - 1. 31.6: 255c
  - 2. 9.7: 1336, 2720
- 4. Josippon: 263–364, 2361a, 3386, 3388c, 3445–3461, 3457d, 3526, 3542, 3544, 3545, 3548, 3549, 3550
  - 1. 1: 1099
  - 1. 28: 354f
- 5. The Syriac Version of Book 6 of the 'War': 206c–e, 2359, 2361a, 3362b, 3362c

### C. Hebrew Scriptures and Septuagint

- Genesis: 661g–697
  - 1–3: 663, 1783
  - 1. 1 (Septuagint): 1783
  - 1. 2: 676a
  - 1. 3–10: 1727–1730
  - 1. 26–31: 665
  - 2. 46–3.24: 666
  - 4. 17–24: 3386a
  - 5. 3–31: 676i
  - 9. 6: 2105
  - 10: 676, 838
  - 10. 29: 676k, 3342a
  - 11: 838
  - 12. 6: 691d
  - 14: 691d
  - 14. 18: 3171
  - 14. 18ff: 689
  - 17. 3 (Septuagint): 3219e
  - 18. 8: 691d
  - 22. 1–18: 691f
  - 22. 1–19: 689
  - 22. 2 (Septuagint): 2130
  - 23. 19: 1354
  - 37. 21–22: 3259g
- Exodus: 698–744
  - (Septuagint of Exodus): 723h
  - 2. 11–12: 723b

3. 13: 1803b  
 4. 16: 705  
 7. 1: 705  
 7. 1–13: 1998  
 7. 20 (Septuagint): 3203c  
 12. 2: 714  
 12. 8–10: 2074h  
 12. 19 (Septuagint): 643  
 12. 40: 710, 744o  
 12. 40 (Septuagint): 710  
 13: 2000  
 14: 744q  
 16. 15: 2057  
 20. 1–17: 1803r  
 20. 3: 2087  
 20. 3–5: 2086  
 21. 7–11: 2038  
 21. 16: 2114  
 21. 20–22: 2038  
 21. 22–23 (Septuagint): 2105  
 21. 26–27: 2038  
 22. 27 (28): 1676a  
 22. 27 (Septuagint): 2095  
 22. 36 (Septuagint): 717  
 23. 4–5: 2122  
 23. 5: 1676a  
 23. 7: 1676a  
 25. 31–40: 1854  
 26. 36: 1848, 1849  
 28: 3385  
 28. 15: 2365  
 28. 17–20: 1907  
 28. 17–20 (Septuagint): 1907  
 28. 36: 1908  
 28. 36–38: 1766  
 30. 11ff.: 1847  
 30. 13 (Septuagint): 1847  
 32: 719, 723b, 744m  
 32. 1–20: 719  
 32. 6–7: 2116b  
 32. 21–25: 719  
 37. 17–24: 1854  
 39. 30–31: 1766
- Leviticus: 3314b  
 1. 4: 2038  
 3. 2: 2038  
 5. 21: 2108  
 9. 24 (Septuagint): 3219e  
 16. 8: 3150  
 16. 31: 1185  
 18. 3: 2095  
 21. 7: 2055
21. 14: 2055  
 22. 24: 2122  
 23. 40: 2077a
- Numbers: 3314b  
 5. 11–31: 1800  
 8. 4: 1628  
 12. 1: 699  
 19: 720  
 20. 16: 1970  
 25. 1ff.: 744j  
 25. 11: 2604  
 29. 1–6: 2077  
 38. 10: 2107
- Deuteronomy  
 4. 2: 645  
 4. 2 (Septuagint): 595  
 5. 6–21: 1803r  
 6. 6–7: 2260  
 12. 2–3: 2095  
 12. 32 (Septuagint) (= Hebrew text, 13. 1.): 595  
 17. 9: 1981  
 17. 11: 601  
 17. 15: 1305, 2903, 2915, 2916  
 18. 10–11: 786, 2089  
 19. 15: 2053, 2054  
 20. 19: 2122  
 25. 5: 2106  
 25. 5 (Septuagint): 2106  
 27. 25: 2051  
 31–32: 722  
 31–34: 722  
 33. 1: 1803g  
 33. 2: 676e
- Joshua: 745–751  
 2. 1: 748  
 17. 8–9: 2863  
 20–24: 747, 1773, 2137
- Judges: 752–753  
 16. 1: 749  
 19–21: 3173p
- I Samuel: 754–786  
 (Septuagint of I Samuel): 783b  
 (Lucianic text of I Samuel): 783b  
 5. 10: 780  
 8: 754  
 17. 53: 783c  
 23. 1: 783c

26. 1: 784  
 26. 3: 784  
 26. 4: 784  
 28. 3: 786  
 28. 3 (Septuagint): 786
- II Samuel: 787  
 8. 17: 2172  
 11. 2–I Kings 2.11: 770  
 24. 10: 2869
- I Kings: 788–806  
 6. 38: 792  
 7. 25: 2084  
 10. 20: 2084  
 12. 29: 806  
 18. 27: 799  
 21. 9: 403  
 21. 13: 2053  
 21. 13 (Septuagint): 2053  
 22. 1–II Kings 25.30: 770
- II Kings: 807–819  
 5. 14: 2546  
 15. 3–5: 1439  
 17. 24ff: 2140  
 20. 12: 827  
 21. 16: 808
- Isaiah: 1035  
 8. 6: 3392  
 10. 28–34: 1070h  
 10. 33–34: 432, 1963  
 15: 751  
 15. 4–9: 1110, 1111, 1112  
 15. 4–9 (Septuagint): 2946, 2947  
 19. 1931  
 19. 19: 1931  
 26. 19: 2260  
 29. 14: 1824  
 34. 5–6: 826  
 39. 1: 827  
 44. 24–26: 1824  
 45. 1: 438
- Jeremiah: 828d  
 8. 34 (Septuagint): 2946, 2947  
 8. 36 (Septuagint): 2946, 2947  
 15. 9: 1731b  
 31. 3–5: 1110, 1111, 1112  
 31. 5–8 (Septuagint): 2946, 2947  
 31. 8: 1110, 1111, 1112  
 31. 34: 1110, 1111, 1112
31. 36: 1110, 1111, 1112  
 35: 2354, 2390  
 46. 2: 813  
 48: 751
- Ezekiel  
 3. 24–27: 828
- Amos: 1803, 2260  
 1. 1: 828b  
 9. 7: 985
- Jonah: 828c
- Zechariah: 1238  
 14. 4: 3031a  
 14. 4–5: 828b
- Psalms  
 11 (12). 4 (Septuagint): 1357  
 44: 919p  
 94: 1184
- Job: 933k
- Ruth: 753a, 753b, 2260  
 4. 2: 3115
- Lamentations  
 5: 1051b
- Ecclesiastes: 933k  
 8. 2–3: 2301
- Esther: 860–868d, 968b  
 (Septuagint): 861, 862, 866, 868, 868a, 868d  
 2. 6: 865  
 4. 14: 647  
 5. 2: 868c  
 Septuagint Additions to Esther: 868c
- Daniel: 821–824i, 933h, 933k, 1009m, 2009b  
 1. 3: 822  
 1. 5: 822  
 1. 18: 822  
 2. 1: 822  
 2. 4–7. 28: 3293  
 2. 19–23: 1824  
 2. 31–45: 824f  
 2. 34–35: 822  
 2. 36ff.: 3356

2. 44: 822, 1966  
 2. 45: 822  
 5. 31: 3438d  
 7–12: 824, 824d, 1009  
 7. 8: 1357, 3302  
 7. 8 (Septuagint): 1357, 3302  
 7. 13–14: 1960  
 7. 20: 1357, 3302  
 7. 20 (Septuagint): 1357, 3302  
 9: 822  
 9. 2: 822  
 9. 24–27: 821, 824e, 1620b, 1961, 1962,  
 1984l, 3356  
 9. 25–26: 821  
 11–12: 1960  
 11. 14: 824d  
 11. 20: 1092j  
 11. 23–24: 824d  
 11. 30: 1101  
 11. 30ff: 3356  
 11. 39: 1051m  
 12. 1: 3356

## Ezra: 829

2. 36–39: 2891c  
 4. 8–6.8: 3293  
 7. 1–5: 2165  
 7. 12–26: 3293  
 10. 6: 854

## Nehemiah

3. 15: 3392  
 6. 1: 2151  
 6. 15: 850  
 7: 852  
 7. 4: 852  
 7. 5–13.31: 839  
 7. 39–42: 2891c  
 7. 73–8.13: 829  
 8. 1–8: 2260  
 8. 16: 1444  
 11. 852  
 11. 1: 852  
 11. 11: 2165  
 12. 22: 919r, 2147  
 13. 6: 846  
 13. 28: 850, 2154a

## I Chronicles: 933l

(Septuagint): 783a  
 5. 27–41: 2165  
 5. 29–41: 1875  
 5. 34–40: 1876

## II Chronicles

3. 1: 1868  
 3. 1–5. 1: 1850  
 26. 19: 800  
 35–36: 829

## D. Other Versions in Greek, Latin, and Syriac of the Hebrew Scriptures

Aquila: 3535

Symmachus: 3535

Theodotion: 3535

Itala: 3535

Vulgate: 3526, 3535

On Genesis 22. 2: 2130

Peshitta: 3541

## E. Apocrypha

I (III Esdras): 829, 834, 835, 836, 837, 838,  
 839, 840, 841, 849, 852, 968b

2: 834

3. 1–4. 58: 859a

8. 73: 3219e

2: 834

9. 9: 843, 844

Additions to Esther: 868c

Addition A: 868

Addition C, lines 17–23: 868

Addition D, line 13: 868c

Addition E: 866, 3301

Wisdom of Solomon: 1771b, 1812

Ecclesiasticus (Ben Sira): 933k, 2048j, 2326j,  
 3219i

15. 11–20: 2315

16. 6–9: 2890

23. 9ff.: 2301

50. 1–6: 1882



I Maccabees: 186a, 581a, 754, 933*h*, 968b,  
 992–1009*k*, 1016a, 1017, 1026, 1051,  
 1051b, 1054, 1057a, 1057b, 1063, 1101c,  
 1102c, 1102*e*, 1107e, 1169k, 1206e,  
 1206g, 1444b, 1718, 1731, 1957, 2242*ze*,  
 2830, 3226b, 3259b, 3535  
 1. 18–32: 1009  
 1. 20–64: 824, 1009  
 2. 25: 1003  
 2. 39ff: 2061  
 2. 49–69: 581a  
 3. 13–16: 997, 998  
 3. 13–26: 1057b  
 3. 49–50: 2082  
 4. 50: 2071*a*  
 4. 52: 2071*a*  
 5. 1–5: 1056a  
 6. 44: 1092*mc*  
 7–16: 1009  
 7. 5–25: 1889  
 7. 8: 98  
 7. 31–32: 1003  
 8. 23–30: 1043  
 9. 5: 1057  
 9. 26: 996  
 9. 40: 1003  
 10. 25–45: 1101d  
 10. 38: 1904i  
 11. 10: 1065  
 11. 34: 1690

11. 69: 1003  
 11. 74: 1003  
 12. 20–23: 986  
 12. 21–23: 984  
 13. 11: 1003  
 13. 31–32: 1092j  
 14. 20: 991*f*  
 14. 41: 1009c  
 15. 15–24: 1102d  
 16. 14: 2067

II Maccabees: 1009*m*, 1010–1016b, 1051b,  
 1107e, 1659, 1660, 1885, 3459  
 1. 10–2. 18: 847, 848, 849  
 3. 3: 1014  
 3. 4: 1883, 1886  
 4. 23: 1883, 1886  
 4. 25: 1883, 1886  
 4. 30–38: 1919  
 5. 9: 991a  
 6. 2: 1016a  
 7: 1731a, 1731b  
 7. 9: 1807  
 7. 37: 1818b  
 9. 5: 1012, 1313  
 11. 27–28: 1013  
 14. 3: 1889  
 14. 37–46: 3133, 3134

Susanna: 3219u

## F. Pseudepigrapha

Letter of Aristeas: 839, 842, 941–949*f*, 968b,  
 1002, 1683–1689, 1692, 1693, 1696,  
 1714, 1793, 1795, 3244, 3535  
 23: 942  
 30: 634, 761  
 83–120: 1703c  
 83–171: 943  
 98: 1766  
 308–311: 595, 649, 656

Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch (= II Baruch):  
 691d, 1590, 2032

Baruch-Apocalypse (= III Baruch): 676j,  
 2022i

Apocalypse of Elijah (Hebrew): 2456b

Apocalypse of Elijah (Coptic): 2456b

Book of Enoch (= I Enoch): 933k, 1238  
 39. 9–11: 1824  
 90. 13: 1138k

Slavonic Book of Enoch (= II Enoch): 2022i  
 Ezra-Apocalypse (= IV Esdras): 676j, 2032  
 7. 89: 2357j  
 14. 44: 661e

Joseph and Asenath: 697b, 2022i

Jubilees: 676i, 691f, 1934a  
 1: 722  
 8. 3: 676d  
 17. 15: 691g

Life of Adam and Eve: 676c  
 49–50: 676d, 676f

III Maccabees: 1084d  
 2. 30: 1482

- IV Maccabees: 691f, *1009m*, 1658–1661,  
1663a, 1663b, 1731b, 1771d, 2022i,  
3238, 3252a, 3365, 3537  
1. 11: 2021  
1. 17: 2021  
1. 19–23: 2021  
13. 12: 691g  
16. 24: 3219e  
18. 24: 2021
- Martyrdom of Isaiah: 808
- Psalms of Solomon: 1176, *1189c*, 1815  
4: 1209a  
17. 5–6: 1131
- Sibylline Oracles: 1238, 1793  
1. 336–337: 1336  
1. 336ff.: 2720  
3. 592: 2395  
3. 593: 2395
3. 689–690: 2890  
4: 1984o  
4. 21–30: 2395
- Testament of Abraham  
4: 685
- Testament of Joseph: 693, 697b
- Testament of Levi: 744o  
8. 11–15: 1967
- Testament (Assumption) of Moses: 676i, 722,  
723, *1009m*, 1731  
8. 1: 1731  
9. 1–7: 1731a, 1731b
- Testament of Solomon  
D: 787  
E: 787
- Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: 788

### G. Dead Sea Scrolls

- Copper Scroll: 1579c
- Damascus Document: 2303, 2304  
5. 6b. 7: 2418e  
11. 22b–12.1a: 2429  
12. 15–17: 2425
- Genesis Apocryphon: 598, 688, 690, 691d,  
706, 723d
- Habakkuk Commentary: *438e*, 1093–1101b  
6. 3–5: 1101b
- Peshar on Hosea (4QpHos<sup>b</sup>II=4Q 166):  
3157c, 3158a
- Peshar on Isaiah (161)  
10. 28–34: 1070h
- Manual of Discipline: 2429h, 2477–2543zn,  
2720w  
3. 4ff.: 2720o
- Peshar on Nahum (4Q 169=4QpNah):  
1063a, 1092k, 1138j, 1138l, 2210m  
3–4 I: 1–2: 1063b, 2170i
- Psalms of Thanksgiving (1QH)  
6. 29–30: 2543s  
7. 26–27: 1824
- Temple Scroll: 2064a, 2543q, 2543ze, 2543zf  
11Q Miqdash 64. 6–13: *1951b*
- Testament of Amram: 744o
- War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of  
Darkness: 691g, 1316, 1934a, 2709
- 4Q161  
fragments 5–6: 1138c  
fragment 8: 1138c
- 4Q181  
1. 2.3–6: 2543s

### H. Samaritan Writings

- Samaritan Pentateuch: 3535  
On Genesis 22.2: 2130
- Asatir Mosheh: 2128
- Samaritan Chronicle: 747
- Samaritan Chronicle II (= Sefer ha-Yamim):  
940b, 2139f, 2153
- Memar Marqah: 710, 723, 744o, 1776

## I. New Testament

Matthew: 2720j, 2891m, 2898d, 3319d

2. 1–12: 2476c  
 2. 1–13: 2894  
 2. 1–16: 2021  
 2. 15–23: 1984s  
 5. 18: 656  
 7. 15: 2559  
 7. 16: 2555  
 8. 5–10: 2891m  
 10. 4: 2595  
 10. 34: 2446  
 11. 7: 2598  
 11. 7–8: 2557, 2599  
 11. 8: 2893  
 11. 12: 3219g  
 11. 25–27: 1824  
 12. 20: 2598  
 14. 3–4: 2708  
 14. 3–12: 2707  
 15. 1–11: 1815  
 15. 2: 2286b  
 15. 4–6: 3212b  
 15. 17: 601a  
 15. 24: 2804  
 17. 24: 1847  
 21. 32: 2720s  
 22. 7: 1057  
 22. 16: 1238, 2457, 2458  
 23. 13–36: 2242r  
 25. 14–30: 2891m  
 27. 51: 2894

Mark: 2891m, 2898e, 3207a

3. 6: 1238, 2457, 2458  
 3. 18: 2595  
 6. 17–29: 2707  
 6. 26: 2716  
 7. 1–23: 1815  
 7. 4: 2286b  
 7. 9–13: 3212b  
 7. 11: 3212, 3212a  
 9. 38: 2892  
 12. 13: 1238, 2457, 2458  
 12. 28ff.: 2891o  
 15. 7: 2637  
 15. 26: 2640a  
 15. 38: 2894

Luke: 2720j, 2891a, 2891i, 2891l, 2891m,  
 2891n, 2891o, 2898e, 3207a, 3219za,  
 3243

1. 5: 2891c

1. 26–38: 2800a  
 2. 1: 2860  
 2. 1–2: 2869, 2873  
 2. 1–5: 2838–2873  
 2. 2: 2839, 2873e  
 2. 3: 2872  
 2. 41–47: 385c  
 2. 41–51: 2891m  
 2. 46–47: 2891m  
 3. 1: 2720h, 2886  
 3. 10–14: 2720g  
 3. 12–14: 2720s  
 3. 23: 2846  
 6. 15: 2448, 2449, 2595  
 7. 1–10: 2891m  
 7. 24–25: 2557  
 9. 51–56: 2891m  
 13. 1: 1396  
 13. 1–2: 1385  
 14. 16–24: 2832  
 17. 26–29: 2890  
 19. 11–27: 2891m  
 19. 11–29: 2832  
 19. 27: 2446  
 19. 41–44: 2891l  
 21. 20: 2891l  
 21. 20–21: 1903  
 22. 36: 2637  
 23. 1–25: 2891h  
 23. 28–31: 2891l  
 23. 44: 2894  
 24. 12: 3286a

John

1. 48: 2555  
 1. 50: 2555  
 9. 11: 3392  
 11. 45–57: 2898a  
 11. 47–53: 1904  
 18. 13: 1904c  
 18. 31: 1948, 2054d  
 19. 23–24: 1909b  
 20. 10: 3286a

Acts: 2891a, 2891m, 2891n, 3243

1. 13: 2448, 2449, 2595  
 1. 13–26: 2889  
 2: 2834  
 2. 23: 2891l  
 3. 2: 1869c  
 3. 10: 1869c  
 3. 14–15: 2891l

4. 6: 2835  
 5. 30: 2891l  
 5. 33–39: 2891l  
 5. 36: 2014, 2874–2885*d*  
 5. 36–37: 2877  
 5. 37: 2842  
 7. 51–52: 2891l  
 9. 10–16: 2888  
 10. 1–11.8: 2888  
 11. 28–30: 2891b  
 12: 2875  
 12. 1–23: 2891b  
 13. 6: 2559b  
 13. 8: 2559b  
 13. 28: 2054*d*, 2891l  
 13. 43: 2932b  
 16. 16–19: 2892  
 18. 9–10: 2891  
 19. 11–20: 2892  
 19. 14: 1904*g*  
 21. 24: 2082  
 21. 38: 1984*s*, 2688, 2886, 2891*r*  
 23. 8: 2235  
 23. 9: 2825*m*  
 24. 27: 2891*g*  
 28. 31: 3219b  
 Romans  
 13. 1: 2836  
 13. 1*ff.*: 2442  
 I Corinthians  
 12–14: 3219l  
 14. 34: 2837, 3214  
 14. 34–35: 2891*k*  
 15. 33: 2326*d*

II Corinthians  
 2. 17: 2559*a*  
 Galatians  
 4. 25: 3172  
 Colossians  
 2. 18: 2559*a*  
 II Thessalonians  
 2. 7: 3219*t*  
 I Timothy  
 2. 11–14: 2891*k*  
 Hebrews: 385*c*, 2551  
 4. 14: 1841  
 9. 1–10: 2898*b*  
 9. 2–8: 3219*zb*  
 11. 37: 808

James: 3231

II Peter  
 3. 10–12: 676*c*

Jude  
 8: 2558  
 16: 2558

Revelation: 385*c*  
 (Syriac version): 2556  
 4–11: 2898  
 4. 6: 3266*d*  
 13: 2898  
 13. 1–4: 2896  
 17: 2898  
 17. 7–14: 2896  
 21. 19: 1907

### J. Greco-Jewish and Greco-Samaritan Writers (except Philo and Josephus)

Aristobulus: 1704  
 Artapanus: 723*b*, 723*c*, 723*k*, 744*m*, 1707*a*,  
 1707*b*  
 ap. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica* 9.27:  
 707  
 Cleodemus-Malchus: 3352  
 ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.239: 991*f*, 1705,  
 1706  
 Demetrius: 1647*d*  
 Eupolemus and Pseudo-Eupolemus: 783*a*,  
 933*k*, 1689, 1793, 3516  
 ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.218: 1705

ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 12.415–419:  
 1707  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1.218: 1707  
 Ezekiel the tragedian: 723*b*, 744*m*  
 Jason of Cyrene: 933*k*, 1016*a*  
 Justus of Tiberias: 1641  
 Philo the Elder  
 ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 1.218: 1705  
 Pseudo-Phocylides: 1771*l*, 1771*o*  
 Theodotus (Samaritan)  
 Περί Ἰουδαίων: 2139*l*

## K. Philo and Pseudo-Philo

- 1732–1776a, 3201, 3203d, 3208, 3210a, 3211, 3219d, 3219h, 3219k, 3219l, 3266, 3266b, 3349
- De Abrahamo  
114: 685  
119: 685  
122: 1789h  
233: 1748, 1759
- De Cherubim  
49: 1789h
- De Decalogo  
84: 2301
- In Flaccum: 1647f, 1771k  
47: 1472  
78–80: 1472
- Hypothetica: 744m, 1646d, 1647a, 1647f, 1737, 1767–1771, 1771f, 1771l, 2041, 2046  
6. 2.3.8: 723b  
7. 1–9: 1771o  
7. 9: 1767, 1768, 2121  
11. 1: 2341, 2365  
11. 1–18: 1771, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2336, 2337, 2347, 2350, 2358, 2359, 2363, 2393  
11. 3: 2365  
11. 14: 2365, 2512
- Legatio ad Gaium: 1385  
160: 2910  
199–338: 1469d  
249: 1771j  
276–329: 3259  
276–333: 1434  
299: 1391  
299–302: 1771g  
299–305: 2093  
301: 1398  
302: 1378  
303: 1394  
370: 1744
- Legum Allegoria: 1771i  
1. 81: 1907  
3. 100: 1789h
- De Migratione Abrahami  
74: 1747  
179: 1792
- De Mutatione Nominum  
202: 1747
- De Opificio Mundi  
1–3: 1749  
1–12: 1747, 1748
- De Plantatione  
130–131: 1825
- De Praemiis et Poenis: 2022g  
28–29: 2022c  
91 ff.: 2022c  
165: 2022c  
171: 2022c
- Quaestiones in Exodum  
2. 73: 1750, 1751  
2. 75: 1750, 1751  
2. 85: 1750, 1751  
2. 112–114: 1750, 1751  
2. 117–120: 1750, 1751
- Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres  
45–46: 1750, 1751
- Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit  
75: 2341, 2365, 2489, 2543zm  
75–91: 1771, 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2336, 2337, 2347, 2350, 2358, 2359, 2363, 2393  
78: 2446  
86: 2418d  
91: 2365, 2393, 2418d
- De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini  
62: 1789h
- De Specialibus Legibus  
1. 53: 2095  
1. 67: 1771e  
1. 172: 1750, 1751  
1. 180: 2077  
3. 63: 1767, 1768  
3. 108–109: 2105  
3. 152: 697  
3. 205: 1767, 1768, 2055c  
4. 30–31: 2116b
- De Virtutibus  
178: 1789h, 2719
- De Vita Contemplativa  
1: 2330, 2331, 2332, 2333, 2358, 2359, 2365, 2466, 2467
- De Vita Mosis: 1737  
1. 28: 2105  
1. 54: 1984q  
1. 185–186: 1997  
2. 36–44: 944

2. 38: 642  
 2. 44: 2022c  
 2. 51: 2022c  
 2. 88: 1750, 1751  
 2. 114: 1766  
 2. 117–135: 1771a  
 2. 132: 1766  
 2. 205: 2095  
 2. 215–216: 2009d  
 2. 288: 2022c

Pseudo-Philo, *Biblical Antiquities*: 600, 605,  
 607, 615, 632, 674, 676j, 683, 691f, 691g,  
 703, 706, 712, 713, 722, 723, 745, 747,  
 753, 760, 761, 774, 781, 782, 1772–

1776a, 1803o, 2055g, 2130, 2131, 2137,  
 3225, 3460, 3461, 3516, 3526, 3535  
 3. 9: 667  
 9. 3: 710, 744o, 1776  
 18. 5: 2132  
 25. 2–6: 2889  
 25. 10: 2169  
 26. 10–11: 1907  
 31. 2: 1597  
 32. 1–4: 2132  
 33. 5: 1776a  
 35. 9: 2170  
 39. 3: 647  
 48: 2170  
 55. 4: 783

## L. Rabbinic Writings

### 1. Mishnah

Avoth: 2009d  
 1. 1: 2286b  
 1. 11: 1957  
 2. 19: 2321  
 3. 2: 2442  
 5. 21: 381  
 Berakhoth  
 8. 7: 3192b  
 'Eduyyoth  
 1. 3: 3303  
 5. 3: 645  
 8. 6: 1910  
 Hagigah  
 2. 2: 1957  
 Horayoth  
 3. 4: 1896  
 Kethuboth  
 13. 1–2: 1892  
 Kiddushin  
 4. 4: 2055  
 4. 14: 828c  
 Ma'aser Sheni  
 5. 9: 1910  
 5. 15: 2299b  
 Makhshirin  
 1. 6: 2642, 3095  
 Megillah  
 4. 10: 719

### Menahoth

13. 10: 1929, 2153  
 Middoth: 1830–1840, 1842, 1845, 1850,  
 1852, 1857c, 1857e, 1857k, 1857m,  
 1857p, 1857q  
 1. 4: 1869c  
 2–5: 1857n  
 2. 3: 1844, 1869c  
 2. 6: 1869c  
 4. 6: 1842  
 Mikva'oth  
 10. 1: 374  
 Niddah  
 5. 3: 2105  
 7. 4: 2543zf  
 Oholoth  
 17. 5: 1892  
 Rosh Hashanah  
 1. 1: 2077  
 Sanhedrin  
 10. 1: 1047  
 10. 2: 2114  
 Shabbath  
 6. 4: 2637  
 Shekalim  
 1. 5: 1847  
 4. 2: 1379  
 6. 3: 1869c  
 Shevi'ith  
 8. 5: 385

- Sotah  
7. 8: 2915, 2916  
Ta'anith  
3. 8: 1951*b*  
4. 5: 2075  
Yadaim  
3. 5: 645  
4. 6: 1458, 3204  
Yevamoth  
4. 7: 2107  
6. 5: 2055  
6. 6–7: 2105  
Yoma  
3. 1: 1869*c*  
5. 1: 1841
2. Tosefta  
    'Avodah Zarah  
    5. 2: 2086  
    Megillah  
    4 (3). 41: 601  
    Shabbath  
    11. 15: 1984*s*  
    13. 13: 374  
    Sotah  
    23. 7: 3319*e*
3. Babylonian Talmud  
    'Arakhin  
    11*b*: 1910  
    11*b*–12*a*: 1184  
    'Avodah Zarah  
    8*b*: 1948, 2048*j*  
    18*a*: 2118  
    18*b*: 2093*h*  
    36*a*: 2311  
    43*b*: 1623, 1624, 2089  
    44*b*: 2086  
    Baba Bathra  
    3*b*: 1226, 2903  
    14*b*: 645, 655  
    21*a*: 381, 3303  
    Baba Kamma  
    82*b*: 375, 610, 926, 1176, 2287, 2299*d*,  
        3117, 3228  
    119*a*: 2918  
    Bekhoroth  
    55*a*: 1957  
    Berakhoth  
    29*a*: 1138*p*, 2295, 2296  
    55*a*: 2242*o*  
    Bezaḥ  
    2*b*: 2057  
    Giṭṭin  
    55*b*–56*b*: 1572, 1576  
    55*b*–58*a*: 3094  
    56*a*: 1514, 1521, 2298, 2597, 2605, 2605*a*,  
        2642, 3091, 3146  
    56*a*–*b*: 426  
    56*b*: 1587, 3380, 3384*b*, 3384*c*  
    56*b*–57*a*: 610, 3091  
    Ḥagigah  
    14*b*: 2122  
    15*a*: 2536  
    16*b*: 2459  
    Ḥullin  
    95*b*: 2536  
    Kethuboth  
    105*a*: 1846, 3082  
    Kiddushin  
    18*a*: 2102, 2103  
    32*b*: 375  
    43*a*: 1277, 1952, 1954, 1955, 2116  
    49*b*: 1984*s*  
    66*a*: 1138*i*, 1138*m*, 1138*p*, 2269, 2291,  
        2299*d*, 3319*c*, 3319*e*  
    68*b*: 2048*j*  
    70*a*: 2105  
    80*b*: 2054*b*  
    Megillah  
    3*a*: 643  
    7*a*: 645  
    9*a*: 449, 710, 744*o*, 944, 2041  
    9*a*–*b*: 601, 2000  
    25*a*–*b*: 601, 1803*n*  
    Menaḥoth  
    28*b*: 1623, 1628  
    64*b*: 375, 610, 926, 1176, 2287, 2299*d*,  
        3117, 3228  
    99*a*–*b*: 2311  
    109*b*: 1882, 1918, 1922  
    110*a*: 1931  
    Mo'ed Katan  
    24*b*: 2055  
    Nedarim  
    8*a*: 2242*o*  
    23*a*: 2321

- Pesahim  
 88b: 2314a  
 Rosh Hashanah  
 5a: 3093  
 19a: 1433  
 22a: 3164  
 24b: 1623, 1624  
 Sanhedrin  
 19a: 1276  
 43a: 1984s  
 49b: 2321  
 52b: 1948f  
 57b: 2105  
 67a: 1984s  
 68a: 2089  
 74a: 3127  
 82b: 2596  
 94a: 2027  
 98b–99a: 2020  
 103b: 808  
 Shabbath  
 17b: 2099  
 21b: 2079  
 62a: 2089  
 63b: 1766  
 89b: 2021  
 104b: 1984q, 1984s  
 116b: 601a  
 119b: 1546  
 129b: 2089  
 152b: 2200  
 Sotah  
 22b: 3319e  
 33a: 1901, 3319b  
 47a: 749  
 49b: 375, 610, 926, 1176, 2287, 2299d,  
 3117, 3228  
 Sukkah  
 28a: 2536  
 51b: 2428  
 56b: 1037  
 Ta'anith  
 5a: 645  
 18a: 1433  
 23a: 1949, 1950, 1951  
 Temurah  
 14b: 2311  
 Yevamoth  
 24b: 2100  
 46a: 2913  
 47a: 2911d  
 49b: 808  
 62b: 2105  
 63b: 2369  
 Yoma  
 2a: 1857j  
 9a: 1876  
 9b: 657, 1546  
 10a: 1857j  
 12b: 1857j  
 37a: 3150  
 39b: 1570, 1959  
 69a: 940e  
 Zevahim  
 62b: 2084  
 116a: 676c  
 Minor Tractates: Avoth de-Rabbi Nathan  
 1. 1: 1971  
 1. 2: 645  
 4. 5: 426  
 5: 2172  
 Version A, chap. 6, sub finem; version B,  
 chap. 7, ed. Schechter, p. 20: 2570,  
 2642, 2685, 3095  
 Derekh Erez Rabbah: 610  
 5: 373, 374, 376b, 376c  
 Kallah  
 6: 376c  
 Pirke Ben Azzai  
 3 (ed. Higger, p. 183): 373, 374  
 Semahoth  
 2. 1: 2117  
 2. 12: 3133  
 Soferim  
 1. 7: 449, 944, 2153  
 1. 8: 643  
 6. 4: 661d  
 4. Jerusalem Talmud  
 Baba Bathra  
 4. 14c: 385  
 Berakhoth  
 7. 2: 1352c  
 Kethuboth  
 17a: 2055  
 Megillah  
 3. 1: 610, 1846, 3082  
 Nazir  
 5. 3: 1352c



- Sanhedrin  
 10. 2.28c: 808  
 10. 6.29c: 2176, 2543<sup>zp</sup>
- Shabbath  
 3. 6b: 2057  
 10. 5.29b: 1546  
 16. 8: 2695<sup>a</sup>
- Shekalim  
 2. 7.47a: 2055
- Ta'anith  
 4. 8.68d: 331
- Yoma  
 6. 4.43c—d: 1882  
 7. 1a: 1909
5. Midrashim
- Mekhilta Baḥodesh  
 1: 1866<sup>k</sup>  
 6. 60—85: 2093
- Mekhilta Mishpatim  
 13: 2109
- Sifra  
 1. 111: 2918  
 27. 34: 1981  
 112c: 1971
- Sifra Emor  
 On Leviticus 22.3: 2107
- Sifre Numbers  
 35: 2082
- Sifre Deuteronomy  
 15, p. 25: 2054<sup>g</sup>  
 80: 610
- Genesis Rabbah  
 1. 2: 1749  
 17. 5: 2242<sup>o</sup>  
 34. 13: 2118  
 37. 1: 1101  
 56. 3—4: 691<sup>g</sup>  
 56. 8: 691<sup>g</sup>  
 56. 10: 3171  
 79: 2055<sup>f</sup>  
 81. 4: 2169  
 82. 10: 2055  
 91. 2: 710, 1776
- Exodus Rabbah  
 1. 31: 3379<sup>b</sup>  
 5: 643  
 38. 8: 1907
- Leviticus Rabbah  
 30. 2: 2611  
 32. 5: 1957
- Deuteronomy Rabbah  
 2. 24: 2921
- Song of Songs Rabbah  
 1. 4: 1749  
 2. 18: 2027
- Lamentations Rabbah: 438b  
 2. 15: 972
- Pesikta Rabbati: 1590
- Pesikta de-Rav Kahana  
 159b: 2116<sup>c</sup>
- Tanḥuma Bereshith (ed. BUBER)  
 11: 1749
- Pirke de-Rabbi Eliezer: 820i  
 48: 710, 1776
- Midrash Shir ha-Shirim  
 2. 7.1: 2616
- Shir ha-Shirim Zuta  
 End: 1902, 2461, 3095
- Midrash Tadshe: 3266<sup>a</sup>
- Tanna de-be Eliyyahu (ed. M. FRIEDMANN  
 [Ish-Shalom])  
 16. 75—76: 2055<sup>c</sup>
6. Targumim
- Jerusalem Targum  
 On Numbers 24. 24: 1101
- Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan: 723<sup>k</sup>  
 On Numbers 24. 24: 1101  
 On Deuteronomy 33. 11: 1107<sup>b</sup>
- Targum Neofiti: 691<sup>d</sup>  
 On Exodus 16. 15: 716  
 On Exodus 20. 1—17: 1803<sup>r</sup>  
 On Deuteronomy 5. 6—21: 1803<sup>r</sup>
- Targum of Onkelos  
 On Numbers 24. 24: 1101
- Targum Sheni: 820i  
 On Esther 8. 12: 866, 3301
7. Other Rabbinic Works
- Seder Olam Rabbah: 669  
 28: 822  
 30: 1184
- Megillath Ta'anith: 1433, 2291, 2292, 2298,  
 2325  
 pp. 257—258 (ed. LICHTENSTEIN): 1137

## M. Pagan Greek Writers

- Aeschylus  
 Agamemnon 1061: 3212c
- Agatharchides: 1671a
- Alexander Polyhistor: 1665, 1705, 1706, 3352
- Antyllus  
 ap. Oribasius 6. 23: 3203c
- Apion  
 ap. Josephus, Against Apion 1. 250–251: 1934  
 ap. Josephus, Against Apion 2. 10–11: 1934
- Apollonius Molon: 1671a
- Appian  
 Historia Romana, frag. 17 (ed. VIERECK-ROOS, p. 543): 372
- Aristophanes: 1671f, 2705e
- Aristotle  
 Ethics: 3538
- Athenaeus  
 1. 3d: 1272
- Berosus: 676i, 1671a, 1671d, 1705  
 ap. Josephus, Antiquities 10. 219–226: 820  
 ap. Josephus, Antiquities 10. 219–228: 819, 820  
 ap. Josephus, Against Apion 1. 134–144: 819, 820  
 ap. Josephus, Against Apion 1. 150: 818
- Pseudo-Callisthenes: 940e
- Chaeremon: 744h, 1671a
- Choerilus  
 ap. Josephus, Against Apion 1. 173: 1691
- Chrysippus: 3132
- Clearchus of Soli: 1671a, 1703b  
 ap. Josephus, Against Apion 1. 176–183: 3388e  
 ap. Josephus, Against Apion 1. 177–181: 1672–1676  
 ap. Josephus, Against Apion 1. 179: 3226a
- Corpus Hermeticum  
 Poimandres 1. 9: 1818eb
- Demetrius of Phalerum: 1793  
 Frag. 67: 1703f  
 Frag. 201: 1703f  
 ap. Josephus, Antiquities 1. 218: 1705
- Demosthenes: 3237
- Dio Cassius: 1070a, 1274, 1329, 1984k, 2395a, 3336a, 3342, 3533, 3542  
 6. 65: 1587  
 37. 1b: 1189a  
 42. 41–43: 1169g, 1209b  
 49. 22: 1179, 1182  
 55. 27.6: 1275  
 56. 46.5: 3214a  
 57. 18.5a: 2901, 2909, 2910  
 59. 23.2: 3335  
 59. 26.4 (Excerpta): 2101b  
 59. 27.3: 1343, 1348, 1349  
 59. 29.4: 3214a  
 60. 6.6: 1469a  
 63. 14.3: 1452  
 65. 8.3a: 3325  
 66. 1: 372, 430  
 66. 4.3: 1620  
 66. 5.4: 1526  
 66. 6.3: 3110, 3134  
 66. 7.2: 1169x  
 66. 16: 1613  
 66. 16.3: 1634  
 66. 17.1: 1620e
- Dio Chrysostom  
 ap. Synesius, Vita Dionis (ed. VON ARNIM, 2, p. 317): 2330, 2500
- Diodorus Siculus: 581d, 998, 1051d, 1701, 1703d, 3219q  
 1. 94.2: 1084c  
 2. 29: 2252  
 2. 55–60: 2392f  
 19. 85.4: 1070c  
 32. 9c: 1065  
 40. 3: 1694, 1970, 2009
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus: 488a, 581d, 1647f, 1721–1726d, 1993, 3215, 3527, 3533  
 Epistula ad Ammaeum: 2252  
 Roman Antiquities: 3239  
 1. 1–8: 2891p  
 1. 4.5: 3259g  
 1. 9–2.29: 1647a  
 5. 56.1: 3259g
- Thucydides  
 5: 595, 645  
 8: 595, 645
- Dios: 1671a

- Galen  
 8. 379: 3203c  
 17(2).692: 3203c
- Hecataeus of Abdera: 933za, 1674, 1677–1703d  
 On Abraham: 985, 991f  
 ap. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 5. 113: 1703  
 ap. Diodorus Siculus 40. 3: 1969, 1970  
 ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 1. 159: 1703  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 183–204: 1691  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 186–189: 2063  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 187: 1070g  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 187–189: 1827c  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 194: 919p  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 2. 43: 1690, 1691  
 ap. Letter of Aristeeas: 1683–1689, 1692
- Heraclitus  
*Quaestiones Homericae*: 3266c
- Hermippus of Smyrna: 1671a, 1676a
- Hermogenes: 3540
- Herodianus  
 8. 5.4: 798
- Herodotus: 1138g, 1671e, 3237, 3240, 3276, 3533  
 1. 10–11: 1602  
 1. 180–185: 3438d  
 2. 123: 1994  
 3. 88: 1350  
 4. 111ff.: 744j, 744k  
 5. 45: 1994  
 7. 69: 1350  
 7. 72: 1350  
 9. 119: 2473
- Hesiod: 933k
- Corpus Hippocraticum: 3538
- Homer: 3204, 3237  
*Odyssey*: 983e
- Iambulus: 2392f
- Libanius  
*Orationes* 20. 30: 3338a
- 'Longinus', *On the Sublime*  
 9. 9: 1727–1730  
 44: 1729
- Lucian  
*Quomodo historia conscribenda sit*: 3333  
 47: 595, 645  
 60: 1722
- Lysias  
*Against Eratosthenes*: 1671f
- Lysimachus: 1671a
- Manetho: 744a–i, 1671a, 1671d, 1703a, 1934, 3351  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 231: 743
- Megasthenes: 1674, 1702, 1703b  
 ap. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* 1. 15: 3417  
 ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 10. 227: 820, 3419  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 144: 820, 3419
- Menander (comic poet)  
*Epitrepontes*, Act 5: 1671h, 2326d
- Menander of Ephesus: 1671a, 1671d, 3351  
 ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 8. 144–146: 792  
 ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 8. 146: 797  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 117–120: 789, 792  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 117–126: 795  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 119: 797
- Menander of Laodicea  
*Περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν*: 1647a, 1647b, 1647f
- Mnaseas of Patara: 1671a  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 2. 112–114: 1084
- Nicolaus of Damascus: 581d, 998, 1001, 1002, 1009d, 1009e, 1009p, 1086, 1087, 1092g, 1120, 1125, 1138e, 1197, 1209c, 1223, 1265, 1328, 1431, 1444b, 1508, 1629, 1630, 1641, 1665, 1671a, 1705, 1708–1716g, 1719a, 1815, 1874, 2213, 2214, 2296, 2847, 2967, 2968, 3219q, 3272
- Herennius Philo of Byblos: 676d, 1703b
- Philostratus  
*Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 1. 21: 824k  
*Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 2.26: 824k  
*Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 5. 27: 430  
*Life of Apollonius of Tyana* 6. 29: 1620c  
 ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 10. 228: 820  
 ap. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1. 144: 820

- Plato: 1138g  
 Gorgias 477A: 2110  
 Laws 6. 782 C–D: 824*k*  
 Laws 9. 854 D–E: 2110  
 Phaedo 61 C–62E: 3141  
 Republic 8. 562 A–9. 576 B: 983*e*  
 Republic 10. 615 C: 1272  
 Seventh Letter: 3538  
 Timaeus 40 C: 1799  
 ap. Plutarch, *De Placitis Philosophorum*  
 5. 15: 2105
- Plutarch: 3540  
*De Placitis Philosophorum* 5. 15: 2105  
 Sulla 36. 3: 2054*h*
- Polyaenus  
*Strategemata*  
 95: 1602  
 346–347: 1602
- Polybius: 186*a*, 968*b*, 1051*e*, 1051*f*, 1605*f*,  
 1726*a*, 1803*h*, 1818*d*, 3237, 3259*e*,  
 3336*a*, 3532, 3533  
 4. 2.7: 1272  
 5. 93.8: 2252  
 7. 7.6: 1644  
 10. 21: 376, 1644
- Porphyry: 84, 3542  
*De Abstinencia ab Esu Animalium*  
 2. 26: 3417  
 4. 11: 372, 3337  
 4. 18: 3338  
*Contra Christianos*: 3337
- Posidonius: 998, 1647*h*, 1803*m*
- Rufus  
*De Renum et Vesicae Affectionibus* 5. 2:  
 3203*c*
- Sophocles: 3262, 3268, 3269, 3272, 3273,  
 3283*b*  
 Ajax: 3260  
 Electra: 3260  
 Oedipus Tyrannus: 787*a*, 3263
- Soranus  
 1. 25: 3203*c*
- Strabo: 933*za*, 1189*c*, 1329, 1671*a*, 1716*a*,  
 1717–1720, 3219*q*, 3272  
 16. 2.16: 3173  
 16. 2.35–37: 2009  
 16. 2.40: 1177, 1178, 1179, 1182, 1185,  
 1189*a*, 1189*b*  
 16. 2.44: 3084  
 16. 2.46: 1338, 1339  
 17. 1.29: 1934  
 ap. Josephus, *Antiquities* 13. 318–319:  
 1086
- Theon: 3540
- Theophrastus: 1674, 1675, 1681, 1682, 1702,  
 1703*b*, 3219*q*  
 ap. Porphyry, *De Abstinencia ab Esu Ani-*  
*maliu*m 2. 26: 3417
- Thucydides: 371*e*, 1138*g*, 1671*e*, 1671*f*,  
 2705*e*, 3237, 3267–3283*c*, 3336*a*, 3531,  
 3533  
 1. 22: 3114, 3259  
 2. 47–54: 1315*a*  
 3. 81: 3110  
 6. 2.1: 1994
- Timagenes: 1002, 1671*a*
- Xenophon: 3237, 3540

## N. Pagan Latin Writers

- Antonius Julianus: 1623, 1629, 3331*b*  
 ap. Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 33. 4: 1580,  
 1585, 1591, 3354
- Apuleius  
*Metamorphoses*  
 2. 28*ff.*: 1904*g*  
 4. 28–6.24: 3333*a*  
*De Platone et eius Dogmate*  
 1. 12.205–206: 2286*c*, 2326*c*  
 1. 584–586: 2286*c*
- Augustus  
 ap. Suetonius, *Augustus* 76: 1185
- Cicero: 385*d*, 933*za*, 1651*a*, 2891*k*, 3245  
*Pro Archia*  
 10. 15: 1*a*  
*Ad Familiares*  
 5. 12: 376  
 5. 12.2–3: 1644  
*Pro Flacco*  
 28: 1169*h*  
 28. 67–69: 1866*k*

- Philippias  
     4. 5.14: 1169w
- Frontinus  
     Strategemata 74–75: 1602
- Hirtius  
     Bellum Alexandrinum 26–31: 1169g
- Horace  
     Epistles 1. 7.20: 1358c  
     Odes 1. 31: 1819
- Justin  
     36. 2: 1185
- Juvenal  
     14. 96–106: 2009aa
- Livy: 186a  
     23. 44: 1602
- Lucan: 186a
- Martial  
     4. 4: 1185
- Paulus  
     Sententiae 5. 23.1: 3133
- Persius  
     5. 184: 1185
- Petronius  
     Frag. 37: 1185
- Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia*: 438a,  
     2334c, 2456b, 3331b  
     1: 1665  
     5. 14.70: 1196a, 2942, 2942a  
     5. 73: 2330, 2390, 2395a, 2500, 2512, 2521,  
         2531, 2533, 2534, 3084  
     5. 74: 3176c  
     7. 65: 3325
- Pliny the Younger: 385d, 2891k
- Pompeius Trogus  
     ap. Justin 36. 2: 1185
- Quintilian: 1647e, 1647f  
     Institutio Oratoria 10. 1.69ff.: 1671h
- Sallust: 1777–1779, 3245, 3533  
     De Catilinae Coniuratione: 1671f, 2705e  
     5: 1777, 3246
- Seneca the Elder  
     Controversiae: 1318
- Seneca the Younger: 385d, 2891k  
     Epistulae 70: 3128, 3149
- Silius Italicus  
     Punica 3. 597: 1607
- Solinus: 2395a  
     Collectanea 35. 12: 3084
- Suetonius: 186a, 438b, 1984k, 3533  
     Augustus  
         76: 1185  
         93: 1359  
     Tiberius  
         36: 2100c, 2909  
     Caligula  
         14: 3335  
         14. 3: 1343, 1348, 1349  
         22: 1449, 3332  
     Nero  
         21. 2: 1452  
     Vitellius  
         2: 3335  
     Vespasian  
         4: 432, 1530, 1547b, 1960, 1965, 1966,  
             2024, 3096  
         5. 6: 372, 430, 438a, 2031a  
     Titus  
         6: 1634
- Tacitus: 186a, 438b, 933za, 1389h, 1594b,  
     1984k, 2968e, 3533, 3542
- Agricola: 1641  
     1: 376, 1644  
     10–13: 1647a
- Annals  
     2. 31: 1346  
     2. 85: 385c, 2909  
     2. 85.4: 1365  
     2. 85.5: 2100c  
     5. 8: 2101b  
     6. 36.4: 1346  
     6. 42: 1350  
     12. 14: 3191  
     12. 23: 1427, 3328  
     12. 54: 1426  
     12. 54.3: 1605, 3330  
     13. 7: 1508c  
     15. 44: 3326  
     15. 44.3: 1400, 1409  
     15. 44.4: 1569
- Germania: 1647a
- Histories  
     2. 5: 3325  
     2. 74: 3325  
     2. 79: 1618  
     2. 99: 1613  
     3. 13ff.: 1613  
     5: 1594a  
     5. 1.2: 1605, 3330

5. 2: 985, 1580  
 5. 3: 3324  
 5. 3–4: 1084  
 5. 3–5: 1588  
 5. 5: 2009<sup>aa</sup>  
 5. 6: 3325  
 5. 9: 1316, 1429d, 1469d  
 5. 9–10: 1366d  
 5. 10: 1547h, 1563l  
 5. 10.1: 3331<sup>b</sup>  
 5. 10–13: 3331<sup>b</sup>  
 5. 11: 1594b  
 5. 13: 432, 438a, 1530, 1547b, 1594b,  
 1960, 1965, 1966, 2000a, 2024, 2031a,  
 2894, 3096, 3331a, 3321  
 5. 13.3: 3331<sup>b</sup>
- Valerius Flaccus  
 Proem: 1592, 1593  
 Valerius Maximus  
 1. 33: 1169h  
 7. 4.3.346: 1602  
 Varro  
 ap. Lydus, *De Mensibus* 4. 53, pp. 110–  
 111: 1084c  
 Vegetius: 2791  
 Virgil  
 Eclogues 4. 34: 1265e  
 Poetae Latini Minores  
 5, pp. 370–372: 3430

### O. Tablets, Inscriptions, Papyri, Prosopography, Manuscripts, and Laws

- Chronicles of Chaldean Kings: 811, 812, 813,  
 814, 815, 817, 2060, 2061  
 Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum 5. 34:  
 1429d  
 Inscriptiones Graecae: 3203c  
 Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae 918: 2852  
 Acta Alexandrinorum: 1488r  
 Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum 132 (= W.  
 Brunet de Presle, *Notices et extraits des*  
*papyrus grecs du Musée du Louvre*, Paris  
 1865, 63, i–vii): 1923, 1924  
 Elephantine Papyri: 919r, 2170c  
 Hibeh Papyrus 9: 810  
 London Papyrus 1912: 1488b, 1488i, 1488j,  
 1488k, 1488l, 1488m, 1488n  
 Nash Papyrus: 1803r
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri 10. 1266, lines 20–29:  
 1635g  
 Strassbourg Papyri 541: 1635g  
 Wadi Dāliyah Papyri: 2165b  
 P. Cairo Zenon 59037: 973  
 Prosopographia Imperii Romani<sup>1</sup> P 563:  
 2101b  
 Cotton Genesis (Manuscript): 3438a, 3438c  
 India Office Manuscript Syr. 9, ff. 52<sup>r</sup>, 54<sup>v</sup>–  
 55<sup>r</sup>: 3362c  
 Vatican Octateuch (Manuscript): 3438a, 3438c  
 Lex Cornelia de Sicariis et Veneficis: 2672,  
 2688  
 Corpus Juris Civilis  
 Digest 47. 17.1: 2116d

### P. Early Christian Writers in Greek

- Acta Pilati (Gospel of Nicodemus): 1728  
 Athanasius  
 Homiliae Paschales 6. 8: 2021  
 Basil: 2791, 3341  
 Clement of Alexandria: 2791, 3219d  
 Stromateis  
 1. 15: 3417
1. 141.1.5: 1705  
 5. 113: 1703  
 Pseudo-Clement: 2406a, 2825b  
 Homiliae: 3354  
 Diodorus of Tarsus: 91a  
 Eklogē Chronikōn (Cramer, *Anecdota Paris*  
 2. 233): 80

- Epiphanius: 2371, 2372  
 Adversus Haereses 1. 20: 2455, 2456, 2457, 2458  
 Panarion  
 Anakephalaiosis: 3362c  
 10. 1–2: 2476a  
 Heresy 19: 2455, 2456  
 Heresy 20. 1: 1308
- Pseudo-Epiphanius  
 Vitae Prophetarum: 824*k*
- Eusebius of Caesarea: 91a, 744c, 1594b, 1771g, 2774x, 2774zd, 2774zg, 2790a, 2791, 2818j, 2824, 2825a, 2825b, 3341, 3353c, 3353d, 3403, 3412, 3414, 3542, 3544a  
 Chronicle: 2825n, 3353e  
 Demonstratio Evangelica  
 3. 5.105: 2792  
 3. 5.105–106: 2795, 2817  
 8, p. 403: 1392
- Historia Ecclesiastica: 2825n, 3353e  
 1. 7.13: 2814  
 1. 10.2–6: 2814  
 1. 11.7: 2795, 2817  
 1. 11.7–8: 2792  
 1. 41–42: 3367  
 2. 23.20: 79  
 3. 7.7–9: 3353e  
 3. 9: 2791
- Onomasticon: 3353b, 3366
- Praeparatio Evangelica  
 1. 491.14–492.11: 3388e  
 9. 8.23: 1707a  
 9. 8.27: 1707a  
 9. 20.3–4: 3352  
 19. 26: 676d
- (Syriac) Theophaneia  
 5. 44: 2795, 2817
- Eusebius of Emesa: 91a
- Pseudo-Eustathius: 2791, 3542
- (Greek) Hegesippus: 3343–3346, 3349, 3353e, 3365, 3379a
- Hippolytus: 82, 1635a, 2330, 2334d, 2492, 2546, 2646, 2669, 2670, 2791, 3350a  
 (?) Περί τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίας: 1652  
 Contra Gentes: 1663d, 2774p  
 (?) Philosophumena (= Refutatio Omnium Haeresium): 2358, 2360  
 9. 18–28: 3347–3350  
 9. 22: 2429a  
 9. 25.2: 2395f  
 9. 26.1–2: 2395f  
 9. 27: 2395g, 2406f  
 10. 30: 255c  
 10. 32: 1652
- Irenaeus: 2774zg, 2791
- Isidore of Pelusium: 3542  
 Epistulae 4. 75: 566
- John Chrysostom: 2791, 3341, 3353a, 3542  
 Orationes adversus Judaeos  
 4–8: 3353  
 5. 8–10 (Patrologia Graeca 48. 896–900): 1960
- Pseudo-Josephus  
 Contra Graecos: 1657  
 (= Hippolytus?) Περί τοῦ παντός (Περί τοῦ παντὸς αἰτίας, Περί τῆς τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίας): 1652–1657
- Josipos (Barberinus Gr. 549): 1662, 1662a
- Josippus (Pseudo-Josephus): 2791  
 Migne, Patrologia Graeca 96. 1441–1444: 1663c  
 Ὑπομνηστικὸν βιβλίον: 84, 1663
- Julius Africanus: 744c, 1507, 2791
- Justin Martyr: 1265*k*
- Pseudo-Justin: 2791
- Pseudo-Kaisarios: 3353, 3353a
- Methodius: 2791
- Origen: 1771g, 2720r, 2724a, 2774x, 2774zc, 2791, 2818j, 2822, 2824, 2825d, 2825i, 3341, 3350b, 3350c, 3350d, 3542  
 Commentary on Matthew  
 10. 17: 79  
 13. 55: 2791
- Contra Celsum: 2825b, 2825n, 3353e  
 1. 23: 3350d  
 1. 28: 1984s  
 1. 32: 2799  
 1. 47: 79, 2791  
 2. 5: 3350d  
 2. 13 (end): 79  
 5. 33: 3350d  
 8. 13ff.: 3350d
- Hexapla  
 Sixth column: 760, 774
- Panodorus: 2791
- Philip of Sidon: 2790a
- Philostorgius: 2791

- Procopius of Gaza: 3342a  
 Tatian: 3354a  
     Ad Graecos: 3350d  
 Theodore of Mopsuestia: 2791, 3542  
 Theodoret: 3341  
 Theophilus: 2791, 3354a  
     Ad Autolyicum  
       3. 20–22: 85, 3351  
       3. 24–28: 3351

### Q. Early Christian Writers in Latin

- Ambrose: 2791, 3542  
 Augustine: 2791, 3542  
     City of G-d: 186b, 2019, 3259f  
       18. 45. 2–3: 3357, 3358  
 Cassiodorus: 3526, 3542  
     In Psalmos 86. 1 (= Patrologia Latina 70. 618): 3559  
 Isidore of Seville: 3412, 3419, 3544  
 Jerome: 438b, 1594b, 2774zd, 2791, 3341, 3371, 3374b, 3374c, 3384b, 3403, 3412, 3414, 3542  
     Adversus Jovinianum 2. 14 (= Patrologia Latina, 23. 317A): 3337  
     Commentary on Daniel  
       9. 24–27: 1563d  
       11. 30–31: 1101  
     Epistula ad Eustochium  
       22. 35 (= Patrologia Latina 22. 421): 566, 3355  
     Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesin: 3355  
     Preface to Books of Samuel and Kings: 661f  
     De Viris Illustribus  
       13: 79, 80, 2788, 2814, 2818b  
 Lactantius: 3542  
     Divine Institutes 10. 14: 3342  
 Minucius Felix: 2791  
     Octavian 33. 4: 1580, 3354  
 Orosius: 438b, 1592, 1594, 2456b, 2791, 3384b, 3384c  
     Historia adversus Paganos 7. 9. 4–6: 1594a  
     Paulinus of Nola: 3438g  
     Prudentius: 3438g  
 Rufinus (Pseudo-Hegesippus): 186a, 186b, 2791, 3374a, 3374b, 3374c, 3526, 3544  
     De Excidio Jerusalem: 3358  
 Sulpicius Severus: 438b, 1521, 1594b, 1594c  
     Chronica  
       2. 30: 1594a, 3128, 3149  
       2. 30. 6–7: 1580–1594  
 Tertullian: 2791, 3354a, 3540, 3542  
     Adversus Marcionem 4. 19: 2840, 2846  
     Apology 22: 3342

### R. Medieval Writers in Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Russian, and Syriac

- Arabic  
     Agapius: 2774zd, 2814–2818la  
     Ibn Khaldun: 3459, 3548  
 Armenian  
     Moses of Chorene (Moses Xorenazi or Khorenats'i): 3362a  
       2. 19: 3362  
 Ethiopic  
     Book of the Mysteries of the Heavens and the Earth: 3460, 3461  
 Russian  
     The Campaign of Stefan Batoryi: 3442  
     Galician Chronicle: 3441  
     The Life of Alexander Nevskij: 3442  
     Tale of Igor's Expedition: 3440, 3441  
 Syriac  
     Aphraates: 3543  
     Theodore Bar Koni  
       Liber Scholiorum 5: 3362c  
     Dionysios Bar Salibi  
       Against the Jews, chap. 1: 2543zm, 3362c  
     Ephraem Syrus: 3543  
     Isho'dad  
       Commentary on Matthew 22. 23: 3362c  
     Michael the Syrian: 2774zd, 2814–2818l  
       Chronicle 6. 1: 3362c  
     Sergius the Stylite: 3362b, 3526a



## S. Post-Talmudic Hebrew Writers until the Eighteenth Century

- Isaac Abrabanel: 3386, 3386*a*, 3388c, 3388d, 3457*a*, 3544, 3548  
 Jacob ben Isaac Ashkenazi  
   Z'e'enah Ure'enah: 597  
 Benjamin of Tudela: 3454  
 Abraham Bibago  
   Derekh Emunah 45b: 3388e  
 Immanuel ben Jacob Bonfils: 3450, 3526  
 Chronicle of Moses: 723d, 723k, 3367c, 3379b, 3536*a*  
 Mordekhai Dato  
   Iggeret ha-Lebanon: 3457*d*  
 Eldad Hadani: 820i  
 Abraham Ibn Daud: 3451, 3452  
 Abraham Ibn Ezra  
   Commentary on Daniel 9. 24: 1563d  
 Hayim Ibn Musa  
   Magen va-Romaḥ: 3544  
 Jerahmeel: 287*a*, 287d, 295*a*, 676b, 3446, 3455, 3460, 3461, 3526, 3548  
 Eleazar Kallir  
   Eikhah Yoshvah Ḥavazeleth ha-Sharon: 313  
 Josef Karo  
   Shulḥan Arukh, Oraḥ Ḥayyim 201. 2: 2430  
 Solomon Luria (Maharshal): 3130  
 Leon de Modena  
   Magen ve-Herev: 3544  
 Nathan ben Jehiel of Rome: 3447  
 Rashi: 3385, 3548  
   On Numbers 20. 16: 1970  
 Azariah dei Rossi: 3457*d*  
   Me'or Einayim 1. 224–225 (Cassel ed., 234): 294  
 Saadia Gaon  
   Commentary on Daniel: 3446  
 Sefer ha-Razim (ed. MARGALIOTH): 820*a*, 1803*t*, 2088  
 Sefer ha-Yashar: 723k, 3456, 3460, 3461, 3526, 3548  
 Samuel ben Moses Shullam  
   Trans. of Josephus, Against Apion, into Hebrew: 3548  
 Toledoth Yeshu: 255*a*, 2799, 2800, 2813  
 Yom Tov ben Abraham Ishbili (Ritba): 3130  
 Abraham Zacuto  
   Sefer ha-Yuḥasin, p. 237: 3388*f*

## T. Byzantine Greek Writers

- Anonymous, De Obsidione Toleranda: 3376, 3377  
 Pseudo-Anastasios Sinaites: 2790*a*, 2790*b*  
 St. Andrew of Crete: 2812  
 Chronicon Paschale: 3379*e*  
 George Hamartolos ('George the Monk'),  
   Chronicle: 2817, 3375, 3379*a*, 3379d  
 Joel  
   World-Chronicle: 80  
 John of Antioch: 80  
 John of Damascus  
   Sacra Parallela: 3438*a*, 3438*c*  
 George Kedrenos: 2817  
 Malalas: 3379*e*  
   Chronographia: 3379d  
     260–261 (ed. DINDORE): 1492c  
 Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos: 3378, 3379, 3544  
 Niketas Choniates: 84  
 Palaea Historica: 3379b, 3379c  
 Photius  
   Bibliotheca: 1636, 1652, 1687, 1691, 1692, 3544  
   p. 33: 1498, 1503, 1507  
 Pseudo-Simeon Magister  
   Chronicle (Ms. Parisinus 1712, Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, fol. 76<sup>v</sup>): 2817  
 George Syncellus: 1507, 3379*e*, 3544  
 Zonaras  
   Epitome: 3379d

## U. Medieval Latin Writers

- Anonymous, *Historia de Preliis*: 3452  
 Anonymous, *Legenda Aurea*: 3381  
 Acardus of Arroasia: 3544  
 Adalger: 3544  
 Adamnan: 3544  
 Albarus of Cordova: 3544  
 Alchrine: 3544  
 Andrew of St. Victor: 3373  
 Angelomus: 3544  
 Baudri of Bourgeuil: 3544  
 Bede: 3371, 3373, 3374a, 3374b, 3374c, 3544  
 Frechulph: 3544  
 Frutolf: 3544  
 Fulcher of Chartres  
     3. 10. 10 (ed. HAGEMEYER): 3374e  
 Galfred of Monmouth: 3544  
 Gerhoh of Reichersburg: 3544  
 Gotfrid (Godfrey, Gottfried) of Viterbo:  
     3368, 3374d, 3544  
 Hincmar of Rheims: 3544  
 Lambert of St. Omer: 3544  
 Landolfus (Landalfus) Sagax  
     *Historia miscella*: 3380, 3384b  
 Lantbert of Deutz: 3544  
 Lupus: 3544  
 Marianus Scotus: 3544  
 Notker: 3544  
 Oderic: 3544  
 Odo of Cluny: 3544  
 Otto of Freising: 3544  
 Peter of Blois: 3544  
 Peter Cantor: 3544  
 Peter Comestor  
     *Historia Scholastica*: 3374, 3374d, 3405,  
     3414, 3425, 3544  
 Rabanus Maurus: 3367, 3372  
 Radulf de Disceto: 3544  
 Rahewin: 3544  
 Remigius: 3544  
 Richard of St. Victor: 3373  
 Walter of Chatillon: 3544  
 Widukind: 3544  
 Wilhelm of Tyre: 3544

## V. Modern Literary Figures

- Anonymous, *El cavallero Zifar*: 3420  
 Nathan Agmon (Bistritski)  
     *Jerusalem and a Roman*: 3500  
     *A Jerusalem Night*: 3501  
 Bernardo J. Aldrete: 3421  
 Alfonso the Learned  
     *General Estoria*: 3414, 3421, 3425  
 Adah Amikal  
     *Herod the Edomite*: 3493  
 Moses Arragel  
     *Trans. of Bible into Castilian*: 3547a  
 Aharon Ashman  
     *Alexandra the Hasmonean*: 3490  
 Winifred Ashton: see Clemence Dane  
 Avi-Shmuel  
     *News of Masada*: 3497  
 Pierre Bayle: 3545  
 Kay Bee  
     *The Trial of Josephus*: 3484  
 Michael Joseph Berdyczewski: see Michael  
     Joseph Bin Gorion  
 Michael Joseph Bin Gorion (Berdyczewski):  
     3457c  
 Nathan Bistritski: see Nathan Agmon  
 Ya'aqov Cahan  
     *Jannaeus and Salome*: 3505  
 Elizabeth Cary  
     *The Tragedie of Mariam*: 3397a, 3397b  
 Fray Bartolomé de las Casas: 3421  
 Nicolas Caussin  
     *La cour sainte*: 3402a

- Guillem de Cervera: 3421  
 Ernestus J. Claes  
     Herodes: 3476  
 Pierre Corneille: 3400  
 Sebastian de Covarrubras: 3421  
 Alvaro Cubillo de Aragón  
     Los desagravios de Christo: 3427a  
 Clemence Dane (Winifred Ashton)  
     Herod and Mariamne: 3489  
 Dante  
     Purgatory 23. 30: 3403  
 Benito Feijóo y Montenegro: 3412  
 Lion Feuchtwanger  
     Josephus: Roman-Trilogie: 3466–3475b  
 Jean Fouquet: 3438f  
 Yehezkel Freilich  
     Masada and Rome: 3481  
 Ernest K. Gann  
     The Antagonists: 3482  
 Robert Garnier  
     Juifves: 3398  
 Gerasime  
     Kitāb al-Kāfi: 2724a, 2818e  
 Heinrich Graetz: 3547  
 Antonio de Guevara  
     Libro aureo de Marco Aurelio: 3420  
 Carl de Haas  
     Berenice: 3504  
 Yitzhak Isaac Halevy (Rabinowitz): 392, 1371,  
     2232, 3547  
 Alexandre Hardy  
     Mariamne: 3402a  
 Friedrich Hebbel  
     Herodes und Mariamne: 3488  
 Caspar Hedion: 3545  
 Abel J. Herzberg  
     Herodes de Geschiedenis van een Tyrant:  
     3492  
 Yitzhak Herzberg  
     Masada: 3480  
 Diego de Hojeda  
     La Christiada: 3420  
 Ferenc Katona: 3508  
 Joseph Klausner: 3547  
 Leon Kolb  
     Berenice: 3485  
     Mission to Claudius: 3486  
 David Kossoff  
     The Voices of Masada: 3483  
 Peter van der Kun (Petrus Cunaeus)  
     De Republica Hebraeorum: 3388g  
 Pär Fabian Lagerkvist  
     Mariamne: 3478  
 Yizhak Lamdan  
     Masada: 3496, 3498b, 3511e  
 Conrad Lautenbach: 3545  
 Edward Lively: 3393a, 3457a  
 Mademoiselle Louise Françoise de La Vallière:  
     3400  
 Nicolas de Lyra  
     Glossa Ordinaria  
         1. 787: 3385  
         1. 805–806: 3385  
 Otto Major  
     Tibériási Justus: 3487  
 Uni Masada  
     Jerusalem: 3502  
 Pero Mejia: 3421  
 Diego Hurtado de Mendoza  
     De la guerre de Granada: 3426  
 Henry H. Milman  
     The Fall of Jerusalem: 3391  
 John Milton: 3393b  
     Paradise Lost  
         1. 11: 3392  
         3. 29–31: 3392  
     Samson Agonistes: 3545  
 Gabriel Miro  
     Las figuras de la Pasión del Señor: 3420  
 Tirso de Molina: 3424  
 Jacobus Johannes Müller  
     Die Doper: 3499  
 Kaj H. L. Munk  
     En Idealist: 3491  
 Naftali Ne'eman  
     Between Him and His People: 3483a  
 Louis I. Newman  
     Masada Shall Not Fall Again: 3498  
 Fermán Pérez de Guzmán 3421  
 Petrarch: 3404, 3405

- Yitzhak Isaac Rabinowitz: see Yitzhak Isaac Halevy
- Jean Racine: 3400
- John Rainolds (Reynolds)  
Treatise on Obadiah and Haggai: 3393a
- Eike von Repgow  
Sachsenspiegel: 3381, 3384a,  
3. 7. 3: 3382  
3. 42. 4: 3382
- John Reynolds: see John Rainolds
- Fray Pedro Ribadeneira: 3421
- Joseph Scaliger  
De Emendatione Temporum, preface: 566
- Schwabenspiegel: 3384a
- I. Segal  
I Shall Refill the Desolation: 3503
- Segrays (Comtesse de La Fayette): 3400
- Madame de Sévigné: 3401
- Shakespeare  
Hamlet 3. 2. 14: 3394  
Othello: 3395
- S. Shalom  
The Cave of Josephus: 3507
- Moshe Shamir  
The War of the Sons of Light: 3506
- Frank G. Slaughter  
The Sins of Herod: 3479
- Baruch Spinoza  
Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, chap. 6:  
De Miraculis: 1985
- Tristan: 3402a
- Samuel Usque  
Consolation for the Tribulations of Israel,  
Dialogue 2: 3457b
- Lope de Vega: 3421, 3422
- Voltaire: 3545  
Juifs: 3402
- Jacob Weinshall  
Herod My Brother: 3477
- William Wordsworth: 3393c
- Stefan Zweig: 3475b

## II. Index of Words

Numbers after the colons refer to bibliographical entries. The numbers in italics refer to the 'Addenda', pp. 899–975.

### A. Greek

- ἀγαλμα: 3193  
 ἀγαμαι: 3193  
 ἀγαπάω (ἀγαπᾶν): 3203, 3203a  
 ἀγάπη: 3203, 3203a  
 ἀγαπήσαντες: 2810  
 ἀγάπησις: 3203a  
 ἄγγαροι: 3193  
 ἄγγειον: 3193  
 ἄγγελοι: 1969  
 ἄγγελοι θεοῦ: 676g  
 ἄγγελον τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ προσταγμάτων: 1970  
 ἄγγος: 3193  
 ἀγέλη: 3193  
 ἀγένειος: 3193  
 ἀγενής: 3193  
 ἀγεννής: 3193  
 ἄγιος: 705a, 3193
- ἀγνεῖα: 3193  
 τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ: 2819  
 ἀδικίαν: 2424  
 ἡ τῶν ἀζύμων ἑορτή: 2072  
 τάθηθι: 2803, 2804  
 ἀθήθης: 2803, 2804  
 αἰᾶι: 3203b  
 αἱματώω: 3203c  
 αἰνίγματι: 3263  
 αἶξ: 3193  
 αἵρεσις (αἰρέσεως, αἱρέσεις): 2242f, 2242z, 2252, 2677  
 αἰώρα: 3203c  
 αἰωρέω: 3203c  
 αἰωρούμενος: 3203c  
 ἀκανθῶν: 2555

- ἀκίδων: 1132  
 ἄκρα: 3014d, 3013g, 3013h  
 ἀκριβεία: 3219a  
 τὰ ἀκριβῆ: 582  
 ἀκρόασις: 2707  
 ἀκωλύτως: 3219b  
 Ἀλανούς: 1358f  
 Ἀλεξανδρεῖς μέν: 1473  
 τάληθῆ: 2803, 2804  
 ἄλλά: 3251  
 ἄλλογενής: 1866f  
 ἄλλος: 92, 93, 3193  
 ἄλλοτρίᾳ πόλει: 1474  
 ἄλλοφωνία: 3193  
 τῶν ἄλλων: 2720s  
 ἀμφί: 3193, 3241  
 ἄν: 3193  
 ἄν ἥδιον: 100  
 ἀναβιώω: 1807  
 ἀναβιώσις: 1807  
 ἀναγκάζω: 3219g  
 ἀνάγκη: 2004, 2216b  
 ἀναγραφαί (ἀναγραφαῖς, ἀναγραφάς): 582, 598, 601  
 ἀναθήματα: 2418g  
 ἀναλαβών: 100, 101  
 ἀναπέμνω: 2116c  
 ἀνασταυρώω (ἀνεσταύρωσε): 1138g, 3318  
 ἀνδραποδίζω: 3283c  
 ἀνδραποδισμός: 3203d  
 ἀνδράποδον: 3283c  
 ἀνεισφορία: 1208, 1209  
 ἀνθρωπος: 92  
 ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ: 705a  
 ἀντικρὺ: 3193  
 τοῖς ἄνω βαρβάροις: 3295  
 ἄξιοι (ἄξιου): 2420  
 ἀπάθεια: 1771b  
 ἀπαρχή: 2055a  
 ἀπατήσαντες: 2810  
 ἀπείροις: 1977  
 ἀπείχοντο: 1185  
 ἀπετίμων: 2863  
 ἀπηγάγετο: 2810  
 ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτόν: 3286a  
 ἀπιστήσαντες: 2617, 2618  
 ἀπλότης: 3206  
 ἀπό: 3193, 3291a  
 ἀπογραφαῖς (ἀπογραφῆς): 2842, 2863  
 ἀποθανεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ παραβῆναι: 3291e  
 ἀποσημαίνω: 618  
 ἄρετῆς: 2248  
 ἀρπάζω: 3219g  
 ἀρχαιολογία: 3206a, 3219c  
 ἀρχαίου: 2182, 2208, 2260, 2390  
 ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος: 3219d  
 ἀρχιερέυς (ἀρχιερεῖς): 1048, 1892, 1904g  
 ἀρχιλησταί: 2685  
 ἀρχοντες: 1048, 1892, 3219e  
 ἄσμάτων: 3204  
 ἀταραξία: 1771b  
 ἀτέλεια: 1208, 1209  
 Ἀτέριος: 1566  
 ἄτρεπτος: 3132  
 αὖξῃσις: 1644  
 αὐτάρκεια: 1771b  
 αὐτός (αὐτῷ, αὐτῶν): 2428, 2471, 3281  
 ἀφαιρέω (ἀφαιρήσιν, ἀφαιροῦντες, ἀφαι-  
 ρῶν, ἀφελεῖν, ἀφελεῖς, ἀφελεῖτε): 595  
 ἀφέξεσθαι . . . ληστείας: 2443, 2445  
 Βαβυλώνιοι Ἰουδαῖοι: 2160  
 Βαδέζωρος: 820d  
 Βαζαφαρμάνης: 119  
 βαλανεύς: 384  
 Βαλέζωρος: 820d  
 βαλνεύς: 384  
 Βαννοῦν: 385c  
 βαπτίζω: 3219f  
 βάπτισιν: 2720h  
 βαπτισμῷ: 2720h  
 βαπτισμῷ συνιέναι: 2720h  
 βαπτιστής: 3219f  
 ἡ βασιλεία οὐρανῶν βιάζεται καὶ βιασται  
 ἄρπάζουσι αὐτήν: 3219g  
 Βεσελεμίν: 1138  
 βιάζω: 3219g  
 βιβλίων ἱερῶν: 652  
 βλασφημῆσας: 2048b  
 Βουδισταῖς: 2472  
 βουλευτής: 3207  
 βουλή: 1048, 1169w, 3207  
 βωμός: 3219h  
 γε: 3193  
 γεγραμμένα: 2274  
 γειώρας: 643  
 γένος: 1671g  
 Γερσηγούς: 2978  
 γερουσία (Γερουσία): 933k, 1947, 1948c, 1948f, 3219i  
 γίνεται δέ: 2797  
 γνώριμοι: 1048  
 γραμματεῦς: 2898e, 3207a  
 τὴν γραμματικὴν ἐμπειρίαν: 3227, 3228

γραμμάτων: 3227, 3228  
 γυμνοὺς δὲ τὰ στέρνα τῶν ἐσθῆτων διε-  
 ρηγμέναν: 3291e

Δακῶν: 2334, 2470, 2471  
 Δακῶν τοῖς πλείστοις: 2474, 2476a  
 Δακῶν τοῖς πλείστοις λεγομένοις: 2470  
 δέ: 828e, 3193, 3251, 3286b  
 δεκάτη: 1092h  
 ὦ δέσποτα κύριε: 1797  
 δεσπότης: 1797, 1798, 1803h, 3219v  
 δευτέρα σκηνή: 3219zb  
 τὸ δεύτερον ἱερόν: 3219zb  
 δῆ: 3286b  
 δημιουργός: 1793, 1799  
 τοῖς δήμοις: 2264  
 δῆμος: 1048  
 διαδέχομαι (διαδέχεσθαι): 3207b, 3219x  
 διαδοχή: 3219x  
 διάδοχος: 3219x  
 τῇ διανοίᾳ τετυφλωμένων: 3263  
 διδάσκαλος: 2650  
 διερμηνευτής: 3219l  
 διερμηνεύω: 3219l  
 δικαιοδότης: 2854, 2855  
 δικαιοσύνη: 3207c, 3208, 3219j, 3219p  
 δίκαιος: 1950, 1951  
 τοῦ δικαίου τὴν πρόσοδον: 2507  
 δίκη: 1277b, 2048e, 3219o  
 διωρία: 3209  
 δόξα: 3210  
 δυνατοί: 1048

ἐάν: 3291a  
 ἕαρος: 100  
 ἐβαπτίσατο: 2546  
 Ἑβραϊκῶν . . . γραμμάτων: 582  
 Ἑβραῖος: 3211, 3219q  
 ἑβραστί: 3291b  
 ἐγγαστρίμυθος: 786  
 ἐγένοντο: 1883  
 ἔγερος: 797, 798, 800  
 ἐγκαταμίγνυσι: 1283  
 τῷ ἔθνει: 2299b  
 εἶδεν: 100  
 εἰμαρμένη: 1803l, 1811, 1813, 1815, 1816,  
 1818a, 1818eb, 2216b  
 εἰμί: 3241  
 εἰρήνη: 3219o  
 εἰς: 3287–3290  
 εἰς αὐτόν: 2428  
 εἰς ἔτι τε νῦν: 2806

τὰ ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων: 2274  
 ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου: 2182, 2208, 2260, 2390  
 ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραϊκῶν . . . γραμμάτων: 582  
 Ἑκβατάνους: 2160  
 ἐκκλησία: 1048, 3210a  
 ἐκκλίνοντες: 783c  
 ἐκμαθόντες: 3228  
 ἐκπέμπει: 1418, 1426  
 ἔκτισεν: 1783  
 ἔλεον: 100  
 ἐμπειρία(ν): 382  
 ἐμπειρίαν λαβών: 100  
 ἐμπέτασμα: 1848, 1849  
 ἐμφιλοχωρεῖν: 3196  
 ἐν ἄλλοις: 3193  
 ἐν ἄλλοτρίᾳ πόλει: 1474  
 οἱ ἐν Ἑκβατάνοις Βαβυλώνιοι Ἰουδαῖοι:  
 2160  
 οἱ ἐν Σικίμοις Σιδώνιοι: 2160, 2161  
 ἐνέπρωσε: 783c  
 ὁ ἐντὸς περιβόλος: 1857p  
 ἐνυπνιαζόμενοι: 2558  
 ἐξαίρεομαι: 3210b  
 ἐξηγητής (τῶν νόμων): 3219a  
 τῇ δ' ἐξῆς: 2075  
 ἐπαρχος (ἐπαρχον): 1399, 1414, 1416, 1419,  
 1420  
 ἐπεφύετο: 2667  
 ἐπηγάγετο: 2810  
 ἐπὶ τε τὰ πρόσωπα κείμενοι: 3291e  
 ἐπὶ τούτοις: 1646a  
 ἐπὶ τούτου: 1429b  
 ἐπιμελητής: 1399  
 ἐπίσπαστρον: 1848, 1849  
 ἐπιστατῶν: 2855  
 ἐπιτελοῦσι(ν): 2334, 2395, 2411, 2418a,  
 2418g  
 ἐπιτρέπεται: 3214  
 τοῖς ἐπιτροπεύουσιν: 1283  
 ἐπίτροπος: 1283, 1399, 1401, 1402, 1414,  
 1420, 2855  
 ἐπιφάνεια: 1795, 1993  
 ἐποίησεν: 1783  
 ἐρμηνεία: 3219k, 3219l, 3298a  
 ἐρμηνεύς: 3219l  
 ἐρμηνεύω: 3212d, 3219l  
 Ἑσσαῖος (Ἑσσαῖοι): 2365, 2373, 2375,  
 2376, 2377  
 ἐσθήν: 2365  
 Ἑσσηνός (Ἑσσηνοί): 2373, 2375, 2376, 2377  
 ἔτει: 1185  
 ἐτέραν: 3214a  
 ἐτετάχατο: 3241

- ἔτι γάρ; οἱ μετὰ Νέρωνα μέχρι οὗ διάδοχοι  
 μενοῦσι; 102*b*  
 εὐαγγελία: 3219*m*  
 εὐαγγελίζεσθαι: 3219*m*  
 εὐαγγέλιον: 3219*m*, 3219*n*  
 εὐεργέτης: 2855  
 εὐνομία: 3219*o*  
 εὐσέβεια: 3219*p*  
 εὐσεβής: 705*a*  
 ἐφημερία: 2891*c*  
 ἐφημερίδος: 2891*c*  
 ζῆλος: 2578, 2584  
 ζηλώω: 2584  
 ζηλωτής (ζηλωτήν, ζηλωτάς): 2580, 2582,  
 2584, 2591, 2595, 2597, 2654, 2677  
 ὁ ζηλωτής: 2595  
 τὸ τῶν ζηλωτῶν κληθέντων γένος: 2596  
 ἦ: 3291*a*  
 ἦ ἀφαιρήσιν ἢ προσθήσιν: 595  
 ἡγεμονεύοντος: 2839  
 ἡγεμών: 1399, 1401, 1402, 1409, 1414, 2855  
 ἡδονή: 2803  
 ἦκω: 3248  
 ἦλθον: 3248  
 ἡματωμένον: 3203*c*  
 ἡμέτεραν: 1622, 1623  
 ἦσαν: 1883, 2182, 2208, 2260, 2390  
 ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ πάντῃ ἀρχαίου: 2260  
 Ἄλλος: 92  
 τὸ θεῖον: 1803*mf*  
 θεῖον πνεῦμα: 1974  
 θεῖος (θεῖοι): 1803*g*, 1803*ma*  
 θεῖος ἀνὴρ: 626*b*, 701, 704, 705, 706*a*  
 θεμιτός: 1803*b*  
 Θεοδώρος: 2882  
 ὁ θεός: 1803*mf*  
 θεοσεβής (θεοσεβεῖς): 2919, 2921, 2922,  
 2923, 2932*d*  
 θεοῦ μοῖρα: 1807  
 θεοῦς: 2095  
 θεοφιλής: 1311, 1950, 1951  
 θεράπων: 3283*c*  
 θῆρ (τῶν) ἀκίδων: 1132  
 θιάσος (θιάσοι): 2083  
 θόρυβος (θόρυβοι): 2796, 2797, 2798  
 Θρακίδας: 1132, 1133, 1134  
 θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσιν: 2334, 2411  
 Ἰαώ: 1084*c*  
 ἴδιος: 1724  
 ἱερογραμματεῦσι: 1977  
 τὸ ἱερὸν: 3219*zb*  
 ἱερός: 705*a*  
 ἱερός γάμος: 3333*a*  
 ἱερός λόγος: 691*c*  
 Ἱεροσόλυμα: 3226*a*  
 Ἱερουσαλήμ: 3226*a*  
 τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων: 652  
 Ἱεσσαῖοι: 2371, 2372  
 ἱκεσίαν . . . προσφευγόντων ἀναιρεῖν: 2122  
 ἱκετεύοντα προσφεύγει . . . ἀνελεῖν: 2122  
 Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου πρὸς Ῥωμαίους: 2356  
 Ἰουδαῖος (Ἰουδαῖοι): 991*c*, 3211, 3219*q*  
 Ἰουδέοις δέ: 1473  
 ἱπτάρχης (ἱπτάρχην): 1399, 1416, 1418,  
 1419, 1420  
 ἴση πολιτεία: 1471, 1480, 1482  
 ἰσομοιρία: 1477  
 ἰσονομία: 1493  
 ἰσοπολίτας: 1488*p*  
 ἰσοπολιτεία: 1487, 2967, 2968, 2968*i*  
 ἰσοτιμία: 1477  
 Ἰσραήλ: 3211  
 Ἰωάννου: 385*c*  
 καθαρός: 3219*s*  
 καθήκον: 1647, 2048*m*  
 καί γε: 770, 777, 778  
 καὶ οὐ: 1724  
 κάλαμος: 2598  
 κατελιγμένος: 100  
 Καλλίνικος: 1062  
 οἱ καλούμενοι σικάριοι: 2667  
 τὸν καλούμενον ζηλωτήν: 2595  
 καλύβη: 3214*a*  
 κἀν τούτοις: 2698  
 ὁ Καναναῖος: 2595  
 Κάνειμος: 1351  
 καρβάνω: 3212*c*  
 κατὰ τοὺς πατέρας νόμους: 3219*i*  
 καταφρόνησις: 3132  
 κατοικία: 1051*m*  
 Κεεῖλά: 784  
 κεκινημένος: 102*a*  
 κελεύει: 2105  
 κελεύσαντος: 3219*r*, 3307*b*  
 κηδεμών: 2704  
 κῆπος: 1117  
 κιβωτός: 1857*a*  
 Κίναμος: 1351  
 κινύρα: 3266*e*  
 κιτῶν: 1357  
 κίτριον: 2077*a*

Κλαύδιος Φήλικα: 1429d  
 Κλούβιος: 1451  
 Κλούιος: 1451  
 Κλούιτος: 1451  
 κοινός (κοινόν): 1945, 3219s  
 τὸ κοινόν: 2245  
 κοινωνία: 1803ma  
 κορβάν: 3212, 3212a, 3212b, 3212c  
 ὁ κόσμος: 3266c  
 τοῖς κρατοῦσιν: 2442  
 κτήματος: 95  
 κτιλίων: 1357  
 κτιλλίων (κτιλίων): 3302  
 Κτίσταις: 2470, 2476, 2476a  
 Κυρηνίου: 2840, 2846  
 Κύριος (Κυρίω): 1797, 1797a, 1798, 2932a

λαβών: 100, 101  
 λαλοῦν μεγάλα: 1357  
 λεγόμενος: 2818b  
 ὁ λεγόμενος Χριστός: 2788  
 λήματος: 95  
 Λιτέριος: 1566  
 ληστεία: 2443, 2444, 2445, 2448, 2449  
 ληστής (λησταί): 2116c, 2444, 2448, 2449,  
 2569, 2576, 2578, 2585, 2596, 2637, 2667,  
 2669, 2677, 2685, 2690g, 2700  
 ληστρικοῦ στίφους: 2669  
 λόγιον: 2365  
 λογιστήριον: 972  
 λόγον . . . παραβιασθεῖεν: 98  
 λόγος πολιτικός: 604  
 τὴν λοιπὴν Ἀσίαν πᾶσαν: 818

Μακκαβαῖος: 1114  
 μάντις: 1978  
 Μαρισηνοῦς: 2978  
 Μαρκέλλον: 1416  
 Μάρκος (Μάρκον): 119  
 Μαρούλλον: 1416  
 Ματθίας: 2882  
 μεγαλορρήμονα: 1357, 3302  
 μεγαλοψυχία: 3206  
 ὁ μέγας: 1270, 1271, 1272  
 μεθρομηνευμένην: 582  
 μεμιγμένον: 2929, 2930  
 μετὰ: 3291a  
 τὰς μετὰ τούτων ἀναγραφάς: 601  
 μεταβάλλω (μεταβαλόν): 3212d, 3212e,  
 3292, 3298a  
 μεταβολή: 3261  
 μεταθεῖναι: 595

μέτριος: 2461  
 μή: 3291  
 μὴ κεκωλύσθαι: 2334  
 Μηϊρός: 3226  
 μηνί: 1185  
 μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν: 601f  
 μήτε προστιθέντες . . . μήτε ἀφαιροῦντες:  
 595, 596a, 601a  
 μισθὸν τῆς ἐαυτῶν σωτηρίας τὸ ἔμδον αἶμα:  
 1818g, 1818h  
 μοῖρα: 1807  
 μονογενής: 1509  
 μόνος θεός: 1789a  
 μυθεύουσι: 1291  
 μυσταγωγῶν: 2719  
 μυστήριον: 3219t

νάβλα: 3266e  
 ναός: 1301  
 νενικημένος: 102a  
 νεώτερος: 3219u  
 νηστεία: 1185, 1189b, 1719a  
 Νικαύλη: 820i  
 νόμιμα βαρβαρικά: 1703f  
 νομοθέτης: 2519  
 νόμος (νόμοι, νόμους): 601, 604, 3213, 3266c  
 ξύλον: 3367  
 ξυλοφόρος: 2075

ὁ μὲν Ἰερεμίας: 828e  
 οἰκονομία: 3219v  
 οἶμαι: 868c  
 ὁμόνοια: 2392f  
 ὅστις ἂν: 3291a  
 ὅτι: 2774v  
 οὐ (οὐκ): 2409, 2413, 3251  
 οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται: 3214  
 οὐ προσθήσεις . . . οὐδὲ ἀφελείς: 595  
 οὐ προσθήσετε οὐκ ἀφελείτε: 595  
 οὐαί: 3203b  
 Οὐδαῖος: 991c  
 οὐδὲν προσθεῖς οὐδ' αὖ παραλιπὼν: 582  
 οὐκ ἀπιστήσαντες: 2617, 2618  
 οὐκ ἐπιτελοῦσι: 2395  
 οὔτε: 1724  
 οὔτε προστιθεῖς οὔτε ἀφαιρῶν: 595

Παλατίω: 3214a  
 παλλίον: 1957  
 παρ' αὐτοῖς: 383  
 παρ' αὐτῷ: 383



παραδιδόναι: 3219w  
 παράδοσις: 3219x  
 παράδοσις (παραδόσεως) τῶν πατέρων:  
     2242m, 2274  
 παρακαλῶ: 3215  
 παρακαταθήκη: 2116b  
 παραλιπών: 582  
 παρανομία: 138  
 παραπλήσιος: 1810, 2211, 3291a  
 παρασκευή: 2057  
 πάροδοι: 3214a  
 παρούσία: 3219v  
 πᾶσαν: 818  
 πάσχα: 2064c, 2072, 2074c, 2074f, 2074g  
 τῇ πατρίῳ: 3295  
 πέμπει: 1426  
 πεπρωμένη: 2216b  
 περί: 3196, 3241  
 περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων: 1813  
 περιεστηλωμένοι ὅροι: 3216, 3217  
 Περιστερεών: 3031  
 περσέα: 2077a  
 πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον: 3219e  
 πῖλος: 2475, 2476  
 πιλοφόροι: 2475, 2476  
 πιστεύειν: 3218  
 πλείστοι (πλείστοις): 2392a, 2470, 2472,  
     2473, 2475, 2476  
 τοῖς πλήθεσιν: 2263  
 πλήθος: 1048  
 πνεῦμα: 1974, 3219y  
 Ποδισταῖς: 2472  
 πόλις (πόλεις): 1488n, 1957, 2006, 2968i  
 πολιτεία: 604, 2005  
 πολίτευμα: 1471, 1481, 1482, 1488n, 1492b,  
     2005, 2968i  
 πολίτης (πολίται): 1488n  
 πολλοί: 2472  
 οἱ πολλοί: 2559a  
 Πομπήδιος: 2101b  
 Πομπώνιος: 2101b  
 πούς: 1297, 2999  
 πρεσβευτής: 2855  
 πρὸ: 3291a  
 προεξεληλυθώς: 818  
 προεστηκώς: 2855  
 πρόνοια: 1812, 1993, 3219v  
 πρὸς ἑαυτὸν: 3286a  
 πρὸς ἑαυτούς: 3286a  
 ὁ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους πόλεμος: 2356  
 Πρὸς τοὺς Ἑλλήνας: 3337  
 προσευχή: 1825b, 1825c  
 προσήλυτος: 2911j

προστίθιμι (προσθεῖναι, προσθεῖς, προσ-  
     θήσειν, προσθήσεις, προσθήσετε, προσ-  
     τιθέντες): 582, 595  
 πρότερον: 1566  
 πρότερος: 3219za  
 προφήτης: 1981, 1984e  
 πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος Συρίας Κυ-  
     ρηνίου: 2848  
 πρώτη σκηνή: 3219zb  
 πρῶτον: 2825l  
 τὸ πρῶτον ἱερὸν: 3219zb  
 πρῶτος (πρώτη): 2848, 2869, 2873f, 3219za  
 ὁ πρῶτος οἶκος: 3219zb  
 Ῥεκέμη: 3170

Σάββατα: 2064c, 2074g, 3307  
 σαββατεῖον: 3218a  
 σαββάτωσις: 3219  
 σαββῶ: 3219  
 Σαβινηρίον: 1510  
 Σαδδουκαίων: 2470  
 Σαδώκ: 2470  
 Σακὼν τοῖς Ποδισταῖς: 2472  
 Σαλαμψιώ: 3226c  
 σαμψηρά: 3307a  
 σάρξ: 1806, 1808  
 Σατουρνίνου: 2840, 2846  
 σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν: 2922, 2924  
 σεβόμενος (σεβόμενοι): 2925, 2932b  
 τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων: 2932b  
 Σεκελάγ: 784  
 σῆ: 119  
 σημείον: 1991  
 Σιδώνιου: 2160, 2161  
 σίκα: 2555  
 σικάριοι (σικαρίων): 2667, 2668  
 Σικέλλα (Σεκέλλα, Σεκελλά, Σεκελᾶ): 784  
 Σικίμοις: 2160, 2161  
 Σιλῶ: 3392  
 σκίσταις: 2476  
 σκυτάλη: 3367  
 σοφιστής (σοφισταί): 2101a, 2649, 2650,  
     3219a  
 σοφός: 2790d, 2802  
 σοφὸς ἀνὴρ: 2801  
 Σπάρτη: 984  
 Σπαρτοί: 933k, 984, 991c  
 σπαρτός: 984  
 στάσεως: 2424  
 σταυρός: 3219zc, 3219zf  
 στολή: 3219za  
 στρατηγός: 1057b, 1235, 1278, 1283, 1340

συγγενεῖς καὶ φίλοι: 1302c  
 συγχωρήσας αὐτοὺς τῇ προτέρᾳ τύχῃ: 3219r  
 συκὴ: 2555  
 συκοφανταί: 1493  
 συναγωγή: 1825b, 1825c  
 σύνδειπνα: 2083  
 συνέδριον: 1048, 1935–1941, 1948c, 1948d  
 σύνεσις (συνέσει): 380, 381  
 σύνταγμα τῶν Γαλιλαίων: 2698  
 συντάγματα: 2498  
 συριστί: 3291b  
 σφαλερὸν εἶναι: 119  
 σῶμα: 1808  
 σωτήρ (Σωτήρ): 604, 1062, 2704, 2855

τέρας: 1992  
 τερωλή: 1117  
 τηρεῖν: 2273  
 τί γάρ; . . . οἱ μετὰ Νέρωνα μέχρι σοῦ διά-  
   δοχοὶ μενοῦσι; 102b  
 τις: 2705g  
 τις ἀνὴρ: 2701  
 τόπος: 1492f  
 τοσόσδε: 2707  
 τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἦν μῖσος εἰς αὐτὸν τῆς Μαρι-  
   άμμης, ὅσος ἐκείνου πρὸς αὐτὴν ἔρω: 3242  
 τοῦτον: 828e  
 τριετία: 102b  
 τριμηνία: 102b  
 τρίτῳ ἔτει: 1266  
 τυροποιῶν: 3031l  
 τύχη (Τύχη): 138, 581d, 1817, 1818a, 1818b,  
   1818c, 1818d, 2216b

ὕβριζιν: 3219zd  
 ὕβρις: 2001  
 ὑπαρχον: 1420  
 ὑπέρ: 3219ze  
 ὑπόμνημα: 1641  
 ὑψηλὴν: 2130  
 Ὑψιστος: 691b

Φαρισαῖοι: 2269  
 τῶν δὲ Φαρισαίων τὸ πλῆθος σύμμαχον  
   ἐχόντων: 2263  
 φέρειν ἐπὶ τινι: 2707  
 Φῆλιξ (Φίλιξ, Φίληξ): 385c  
 φιλαληθέστατος: 566  
 φιλαληθείης: 566  
 φιλανθρωπία: 3219zg  
 φιλανθρώποις λόγοις: 3219zg  
 φιλοσοφίαι: 2252  
 φοβούμενος: 2932b  
 φύλακας: 968c  
 φύλον: 2807, 2808

Χεθίμ: 1101  
 χρεία: 968c  
 τὸ χρέον: 3262  
 χρεῶν: 2216b  
 χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος: 138  
 χρίζονται: 96  
 χριστός (Χριστός): 1308, 1319, 2022j, 2774v,  
   2786, 2788, 2790c  
 ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος: 2810  
 ψευδοπροφητῆς: 1978  
 ψυχὴ: 3219y

## B. Latin

*Accaron*: 783  
*aequus*: 2101b  
*affectantem*: 2591, 2654  
*Bithus contra Bacchium*: 1358c  
*Cataphractarii*: 3303  
*Christiani*: 1581  
*consilium*: 1169w  
*credebatur esse Christus*: 2788, 2818b  
*diligentissimus*: 566  
*excidium*: 186b  
*fiscus Judaicus*: 1169x  
*Iao*: 1084c  
*in terram visionis*: 2130  
*iubeo*: 3307b  
*Iudaeae caput*: 2968e

*Iudaei*: 985  
*ius gladii*: 1281  
*latus clavus*: 1373  
*legatus Caesaris*: 2855  
*legatus censuum accipiendorum*: 2855  
*legatus iuridicus*: 2855  
*[legatus pro praetore] divi Augusti iterum  
 Syriam et Ph[oenicem optinuit]*: 2852  
*limes*: 3058  
*lituus*: 3188  
*numina*: 1395  
*opus reticulum*: 2987  
*pallium*: 1957  
*per saeculorum milia*: 2390  
*perplurima multitudo*: 2720s

*praefectus*: 1399–1415, 1429c  
*princeps*: 1469  
*procurator*: 1399–1415, 1429c  
*proc(urator) Aug(usti)*: 1406  
*relegatio*: 2116d

*sanctissimi commilitiones*: 185  
*senatum, id est orbis terrae consilium*: 1169w  
*studiosos*: 2591, 2654  
*Tiphys*: 1265e  
*zelotas*: 2591

### C. Hebrew and Aramaic

(arranged according to the order of the Hebrew alphabet)

*ʾabtilos*: 1957  
*ʾadōn*: 3219i  
*ʾōb*: 786  
*ʾōr*: 2377, 2378  
*ʾisiin*: 2373  
*ʾakhsaniah*: 749  
*ʾel ha-(h)khalah*: 784  
*ʾel-nakhon*: 784  
*ʾaseyaʾ*: 2371, 2372, 2466, 2467  
*ʾApikoros*: 2321  
*ʾapalyon*: 1957  
*ʾesh*: 2377, 2378  
*ʾeshin*: 2377  
*balan*: 385  
*benei zadok*: 2326e  
*bar bezwaʾ*: 2559a  
*Biryoni*: 2569, 2597, 2605  
*bešelamin*: 1138  
*bat kol*: 1967  
*Gibor*: 1316  
*gavra ketilaʾ*: 3302  
*gader*: 843, 844  
*gioraʾ*: 643  
*legaleah nazir*: 2082  
*ger toshav*: 2100  
*hakhenō*: 2057  
*zaken*: 375  
*ḥaburah*: 2486  
*ḥaburoth*: 2438  
*ḥōzēh*: 2375, 2376, 2559b  
*ḥōshen*: 2365, 2370  
*ḥāzōyāʾ*: 2375, 2376  
*ḥezwānāʾ*: 2375, 2376  
*ḥakhamim*: 3219a  
*ḥalemāʾ*: 2559a  
*ḥamas*: 2445  
*ḥesed*: 753b  
*ḥrṣ*: 3031i  
*ḥashaʾim*: 2369, 2374  
*ḥashaʾin*: 2369, 2374  
*tebul yom*: 2425a  
*yeharōg vʾal yeʾāvōr*: 3219e  
*loʾ tosef . . . veloʾ tigeraʾ*: 595

*loʾ tosifu . . . veloʾ tigereʾu*: 595  
*midelok*: 783c  
*malakh*: 1970  
*ha-Moraʾah*: 2130  
*moreh*: 2519  
*moreh ha-zedek*: 2519  
*ha-Moriah*: 2130  
*merapeʾ*: 2371, 2372  
*mikveh*: 1114  
*mikvaoth*: 3125, 3147  
*Nikaulin*: 820i  
*nafal ʾal ʾapov*: 3219e  
*Sikarin*: 2642, 3095  
*seneh*: 2555  
*Serikonin*: 3095  
*ʾeved*: 3203e  
*ʾeden*: 1118  
*ʾalal*: 3219zd  
*ʾam ha-ʾarez*: 1107, 2380  
*ʾazemoth ḥamor*: 3204  
*Asartha (ʾAzartha)*: 3291b, 3291c  
*ʾAqulah*: 3388f  
*ʾarakhin*: 2055b  
*ʾeshah*: 2479  
*philosophos*: 376c  
*Pascha*: 3291b  
*Perushim*: 2247, 2269, 2270  
*zedek*: 2429p, 2543v  
*zedakah*: 3208  
*kedem*: 984  
*kōreʾa ʾad sheyegaleh eth lebo*: 3219e  
*ketilaʾ*: 1357, 3302  
*kannaʾi*: 2595, 2598  
*Kannaim (Qannaim)*: 2570, 2597, 2601, 2602  
*kaneh*: 2598  
*korban*: 3212a, 3212b, 3212c  
*rosh*: 3219i  
*rab*: 1271  
*rabim*: 2392a  
*ha-rabim*: 2470, 2472  
*ruah*: 1974, 3219y  
*shosim*: 783c  
*teʾudoth*: 2881

## D. Other Languages

Arabic	Rumanian
<i>tlw</i> : 1512	<i>plisc</i> : 2473
Egyptian	Sumerian
<i>yao</i> : 1084c	<i>Gan-na-im-a-an</i> : 2602
Hyksos	<i>Ush-gu-ri</i> : 2679
<i>hikkhase</i> : 739	Syriac
<i>I'kb</i> : 730	<i>hazoiai</i> : 2556
Parthian (Persian)	Thracian
<i>safsira</i> : 3307a	<i>pleisk</i> : 2473, 2475, 2476
<i>saqrātiyūn</i> : 2679	
Phoenician	Indo-European
<i>'eved 'elyon</i> : 1957	<i>*pleus</i> : 2475, 2476
<i>trpl</i> : 1117	

## III. Index of Names of Modern Writers

ANONYMOUS: 491, 498, 501, 504, 506, 508, 516, 519, 523, 528, 529, 533, 535, 1259, 2718, 3432, 3433, 3435, 3436, 3462, 3463, 3464, 3465	AIZAWA, BUNZO: 555, 1169f, 1265a, 1265b, 1494a, 2583a
AALDERS, GERHARD J. D.: 1140	ALBECK, HANOC (CHANOCH): 1936, 2048a, 2326f
AALEN, SVERRE: 1821, 2077, 2837, 3214	ALBREKTSON, BERTIL: 656
ABEL, ERNEST L.: 1366, 1547b, 1699, 2911	ALBRIGHT, WILLIAM F.: 803, 820c, 2225, 3003, 3009
ABEL, FÉLIX-MARIE: 368, 991b, 1001, 1056, 1105, 1173, 1321, 1337, 1564, 1708, 2935, 2989	ALESSANDRÍ, SALVATORE: 1169h
ABERBACH, MOSES (MOSHE): 395, 418, 719, 1143, 1144, 1145, 1209a, 1245, 1426, 1538, 2909, 3327	ALEXANDER, PHILIP S.: 676
VON ABERLE, MORITZ: 2855	ALFARIC, PROSPER: 2210d
ABRAHAMS, ISRAEL: 409, 937, 1600	ALFÖLDY, GÉZA: 1366a
ACCAME, SILVIO: 2856	ALKALAJ, ARON: 370
ACKROYD, PETER R.: 2135, 2148	ALLEGRO, JOHN M.: 911, 1132, 2453, 2602, 2679, 3118
ADAM, ALFRED: 59b, 384, 2332	ALLEN, J. E.: 2054d
ADAN (BAYEWITZ), DAVID: 3031j	ALLERHAND, JACOB: 2242za
ADINOLFI, MARCO: 1099b	ALLGIER, ARTHUR: 730
ADLER, ELHANAN: 23a	ALLON (ALON), GEDALIAH (GEDALIAHU, GEDALYAHU): 438c, 1169j, 1481a, 1528e, 1587, 1892, 2055c, 2291, 2299b, 2299d
ADRIANI, MAURILIO: 1077	ALON, AZARIAH: 3039
AEŠCOLY, AARON Z.: 363, 3460, 3461, 3549, 3550	ALON, GEDALIAH: see ALLON
AFRICA, THOMAS W.: 369	ALT, ALBRECHT: 728, 741, 961, 2139, 2944, 2975
AGMON (BISTRITSKI), NATHAN: 3500, 3501	ALTANER, BERTHOLD: 3357
AGOURIDES, SABBAS C.: 247, 524, 933zb	ALTER, ROBERT: 3149, 3510
AHARAH, S.: 1605b	ALTHEIM, FRANZ: 1358a, 1511, 2917
AHARONI, YOĦANAN: 3043, 3045	ALTSHULER, DAVID: 1651b, 1726, 2048, 3314b
AHRENS, WILHELM: 3429	ALY, WOLFGANG: 1185, 1717

- AMADON, GRACE: 2072  
 AMARU, BETSY: 2012*b*  
 AMATO, ANGELO: 2774*zi*  
 AMIKAL, ADAH: 3493  
 AMIR, JOSHUA (YEHOShUA, JEHOShUA):  
     1803*m*, 2022*f*  
 AMIRAN, DAVID H. K.: 3001*n*, 3001*o*  
 AMIRAN, RUTH: 3011  
 AMIT, DAVID: 154*b*, 2986*c*, 2988*c*, 3036*b*,  
     3112*d*, 3173*b*  
 AMOUSSINE (AMUSSIN, AMUSIN), JOSEPH (I.)  
     D.: 1070*h*, 1092*k*, 1135, 1138*c*, 1138*j*,  
     1484, 2210*m*, 2445, 3157*c*, 3158, 3158*a*  
 AMSTUTZ, JOSEPH: 3206  
 AMUSSIN (AMUSIN), JOSEPH: see AMOUSSINE  
 VON ANDEL, G. K.: 1594*b*  
 ANDERSEN, FRANCIS I.: 232, 3375  
 ANDERSON, GEORGE W.: 658  
 ANDERSON, HUGH: 900, 1250, 2539  
 D'ANDILLY, ARNAULD: 130, 565*h*  
 ANGELOV, BONJU ST.: 3443  
 ANGUS, SAMUEL: 2565  
 APPLEBAUM, SHIMON: 933*zc*, 1092*f*, 1168,  
     1169*p*, 1169*y*, 1258, 1265*g*, 1287, 1340*b*,  
     1487, 1488*s*, 1493, 1494, 1547*c*, 1547*d*,  
     1563*p*, 1628*d*, 2672, 3133, 3173*s*, 3173*t*  
 ARARAT, NISAN: 841  
 ARAZY, ABRAHAM: 3219*q*  
 ARENDZEN, JOHN P.: 2812  
 ASHMAN, AHARON: 3490  
 ASHTON, WINIFRED: see DANE, CLEMENCE  
 ATKINSON, K. M. T.: 1934*a*  
 Atti del Convegno biblico-francescano:  
     1575  
 ATTRIDGE, HAROLD W.: 594, 624, 721, 1725,  
     1803*a*, 2583, 3252  
 AVENARIUS, GERT: 573, 593, 626, 1631, 1671,  
     1723, 1994, 3333  
 AVIGAD, NAHMAN: 1297*b*, 3001*c*, 3001*q*,  
     3001*r*, 3012, 3043, 3173*g*  
 AVIGAD, NIGEL: 599  
 AVIGDOR, HAVA: 3401  
 AVISHAR, EITAN: 1054  
 AVI-SHMUEL [*sic*]: 3497  
 AVI-YIFTAH, S.: 3038  
 AVI-YONAH, MICHAEL: 874, 933, 933*r*, 1113,  
     1189, 1251, 1295, 1296, 1563*k*, 1567, 1836,  
     1839, 1840, 1857*r*, 2087, 2934, 2938, 2943,  
     2957*j*, 2957*l*, 2964, 2971, 2972, 2978, 2992,  
     2993, 2998, 3001*d*, 3001*i*, 3001*t*, 3010,  
     3014*a*, 3014*h*, 3028, 3041, 3042, 3043,  
     3044, 3158*d*, 3158*e*, 3173*r*, 3366  
 AZIZA, CLAUDE: 3354*a*  
 BAARLINK, HEINRICH: 2898*f*  
 BADIA, L. F.: 2720*w*  
 BADIAN, ERNST: 1031  
 BAECK, LEO: 2242*a*, 2247  
 BAER, YITZHAK F.: 186, 320, 344, 354*a*, 391,  
     427, 1024, 1136, 1527, 1576, 1671*f*, 1942,  
     2242*m*, 2469, 2705*e*, 3083, 3283*a*, 3331,  
     3384*b*, 3453  
 BAGATTI, BELLARMINO: 1868, 1868*a*  
 BAGLIO, GAETANO: 2865*a*  
 BAGNALL, ROGER S.: 983*d*  
 BAHAT, D.: 3031*f*  
 BAIER, WERNER: 38*a*, 1825*a*, 2986*a*  
 BAILLY, AUGUSTE: 1307*e*  
 BALCH, DAVID L.: 1647*a*, 1647*b*  
 BALSDON, JOHN P. V. D.: 1448  
 BAMBERGER, BERNARD J.: 2899, 2913  
 BAMMEL, ERNST (ERNEST): 1191, 1196, 1284,  
     1302*a*, 1373*b*, 1377, 1433, 1608, 1890,  
     1895, 1948, 2326*e*, 2724*c*, 2774*z*, 2800,  
     2810, 2818, 2898*a*  
 BAR-ADON, PESSAH: 2543*r*, 3173*i*  
 BARAG, D.: 1508*d*  
 BARAS, ZVI: 2774*x*, 2825*j*  
 BARASCH, MOSES: 475  
 BARDTKE, HANS: 58, 868*b*, 2548  
 BARDY, GUSTAVE: 3341  
 BARISH, DAVID A.: 1646*a*, 1651*a*, 3314*a*  
 BAR-KOCHVA, BEZALEL: 933*zd*, 1009*d*, 1009*e*,  
     1009*f*, 1057, 1057*a*, 1057*b*, 1092*h*, 1101*c*,  
     1138*e*, 1563*g*, 1563*h*, 1716*e*, 2974, 3112*c*,  
     3173*k*  
 BARNES, TIMOTHY D.: 1275, 1594*a*  
 BARNETT, P. W.: 1366*d*, 1984*w*, 1984*x*,  
     2873*e*  
 BARNIKOL, ERNST: 2713, 2748  
 BARON, SALO W.: 108, 269, 304, 876, 1488*a*,  
     2104, 2568, 2905, 3548  
 BARR, JAMES: 3202  
 BARRETT, ANTHONY A.: 1508*c*  
 BARRETT, CHARLES K.: 110, 143, 550,  
     2747  
 BARRETT, D. S.: 1558  
 BARTHÉLEMY, DOMINIQUE: 626*g*, 770  
 BARTINA, SEBASTIAN: 1403  
 BARTLETT, JOHN R.: 1005  
 BASKIN, JUDITH R.: 7441  
 BASNAGE, JACQUES: 316  
 BASTOMSKY, S. J.: 1514  
 BAUER, WALTER: 1958, 2336, 2750  
 BAUERNFEIND, OTTO: 138, 453, 806, 3115,  
     3255, 3514  
 BAUMANN, ARNULF: 403

- BAUMBACH, GÜNTHER: 2210t, 2241, 2317, 2577, 2600, 2612, 2630, 2640h, 2640l, 2664, 2665, 2666, 2667, 3097
- BAUMGARTEN, JOSEPH M.: 2286a, 2407, 2418f, 2425, 2425a
- BAVIER, RICHARD: 37
- BAYER, BATHJA: 1260, 3434, 3439
- BAYEWITZ, DAVID: 3031j
- BEASLEY-MURRAY, GEORGE R.: 2429b, 2911e
- BEATTIE, D. R. G.: 753a
- BECHER, ILSE: 1070b
- BECK, HANS G.: 3378
- BECKWITH, ROGER T.: 2055i, 2418
- BEQ, JEAN: 1237
- BEE, KAY: 3484
- BEEK, MARTINUS A.: 164, 165, 884, 1925, 2414
- BEILIN, ELAINE: 3397b
- BELKIN, SAMUEL: 1770, 2007, 2044, 2046, 2049, 2095, 2107, 2121
- BELL, ALBERT A., JR.: 184a, 186a, 186b, 2724b, 2800a, 3192d
- BELL, HAROLD IDRIS: 1084d, 1473, 1474, 1488b
- BELLINGER, ALFRED R.: 1104
- BEN-AMOS, DAN: 3457c
- BEN-ARIEH, SARA: 3014l, 3014m
- BEN CHAIM, SHELOMO: 968f
- BEN-CHORIN, SCHALOM: 2774n
- BEN-DAVID, ARYE: 2093e, 3186, 3192b
- BEN-DOV, MEIR: 3001l
- DE BENETTI, LINO: 660
- BENGTSON, HERMANN: 549, 1278, 1298, 1620g
- BEN IEHUDA, ELIESER: 2378
- BENKO, STEPHEN: 1469a
- BENNETT, BOYCE M.: 3165
- BENOIT, ANDRÉ: 38, 902, 2542, 2613, 2678, 3512
- BENOIT, PIERRE: 2429i, 2720e, 3020, 3020a, 3026
- BENTWICH, NORMAN D.: 402, 405, 462, 482, 490, 1737, 2098, 2229, 2382
- BÉRANGER, JEAN: 1362
- BÉRARD, JEAN: 738
- BERDICHEVSKY, EMANUEL: see BIN GORION
- BERENDTS, ALEXANDER: 218, 219, 236
- VAN DEN BERG, HILDA: 3377
- BERGER, FRITZ: 2983
- BERGER, KLAUS: 787, 1803o, 3210a, 3219p
- BERGMANN, JUDAH: 2279, 3085
- BERGMEIER, ROLAND: 1844, 1909, 2442, 2836, 3265
- BERLIN, CHARLES: 6, 15
- BERNAYS, JAKOB: 1580
- BERNHARDT, KARL-H.: 1398a
- BERNSTEIN, LEON: 476
- BERNSTEIN, MOSHE J.: 753b
- BERTHOLET, ALFRED: 500
- BERTRAM, GEORG: 567, 2001, 3219zd
- BESSONE, L.: 1517a
- BEST, ERNEST: 1974, 3219z
- BETZ, OTTO: 385e, 806, 1951b, 1983, 1989, 1998, 2344, 2421, 2435, 2549, 2618a, 2663
- BEVAN, EDWYN (ROBERT): 469, 1092a, 2086, 2210b, 2216a, 2357b
- BICKERMAN (BICKERMANN, BIKERMAN), ELIAS (ÉLIE) J.: 862, 962, 963, 967, 971, 1014, 1019, 1020, 1021, 1025, 1082, 1083, 1171, 1206c, 1647d, 1670, 1861, 1935, 2100a, 2161, 2418a, 3387
- BICKERMANN, ELIAS J.: see BICKERMAN
- BIELER, LUDWIG: 701
- BIENERT, WALTHER: 242, 2727
- BIETENHARD, HANS: 1805, 2955, 3176d
- BIGARÉ, G.: 525
- BIHL, WOLFDIETER: 13, 13b
- BIHLER, JOHANNES: 1803f, 2418c
- BIKERMAN, ELIAS J.: see BICKERMAN
- BILDE, PER: 1469d, 1547l, 1771j
- BILGRAY, ALBERT: 14
- BIN GORION (BERDICHEVSKY), EMANUEL (MICHA J.): 151, 425a, 1984c, 2720l, 2774h, 2818n
- BIRLEY, ERIC: 1603
- BISTRITSKI, NATHAN: see AGMON
- BJERKELUND, CARL J.: 3215
- BLACK, MATTHEW: 2334f, 2357l, 2392e, 2400a, 2418b, 2429f, 2512, 2515, 2614, 2689, 2690j, 2884, 3347
- BLAIKLOCK, EDWARD M.: 1154
- BLANCHETIÈRE, FRANÇOIS: 954
- BLATT, FRANZ: 82, 188, 189, 193, 196, 633
- BLAU, JOSEPH L.: 108
- BLEICKEN, JOCHEN: 1169w, 1429a, 2891e
- BLINKINSOPP, JOSEPH: 1981, 2020, 2216, 2891, 3262
- BLIDSTEIN, GERALD J.: 2429n
- BLINZLER, JOSEF: 510, 1228, 1396, 2746, 2823, 2825g, 2832
- BLOCH, ABRAHAM P.: 2071a
- BLOCH, HEINRICH: 1666, 3536c
- BLOCH, RENÉE: 601, 623, 643b, 723e
- BLOMQVIST, JERKER: 3286
- BLUMENKRANZ, BERNHARD: 3371
- BOAS, HENRIËTTE: 578
- BÖCHER, OTTO: 2032

- BOELTER, FRANCIS W.: 3173u  
 BOMSTAD, ROLAND G.: 488b, 1635f, 3259f  
 BONSIRVEN, JOSEPH: 882, 2175, 2223, 2609  
 BORG, MARC: 2596  
 BORGER, RIEKELE: 142  
 BORST, ARNO: 676j, 1771c, 3266b  
 BORZSÁK, ISTVÁN: 17  
 DE BOSQUE, ANDRÉE: 197  
 BOSWORTH, A. B.: 1358f  
 BOTEZ, AL. A.: 1241  
 BOTTE, BERNARD: 1653  
 BOTTERWECK, G. JOHANNES: 565b  
 BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, A.: 1051f  
 BOWERSOCK, GLEN W.: 474a, 1282, 1620i, 2957f, 3155a  
 BOWKER, JOHN: 640, 2270  
 BOWMAN, JOHN: 1877, 1904c, 2074i, 2134, 2165  
 BOX, GEORGE H.: 899  
 BOX, HERBERT: 1477  
 BRADFORD, ERNLE: 1070d, 1307b  
 BRAND, JEHOShUA (YEHOSHUA, JOSHUA): 1855, 1918, 3083a, 3164  
 BRANDON, SAMUEL G. F.: 234, 416, 416a, 904, 1233, 1379, 1380, 1398, 1413, 1520, 1529, 1549, 1568, 2016, 2573, 2601, 2635, 2636, 2637, 2638, 2640n, 2640u, 2647, 2668, 2682, 2764, 2789, 2822, 2825d  
 BRANT, WALTER: 2339, 2712  
 BRASLAWSKY, JOSEPH: 3037  
 BRATKE, E.: 2790b  
 BRAUER, GEORGE C., JR.: 3074  
 BRAUN, FRANÇOIS-MARIE: 2643, 2774e  
 BRAUN, HERBERT: 57, 2396, 2501  
 BRAUN, MARTIN: 551, 692, 693, 702, 1222  
 BRAUNERT, HORST: 2861  
 BRAVERMAN, JAY: 661f, 822, 1092j, 1101, 1563d, 3356  
 BRAYER, MENAHEM M.: 2401  
 BREITENSTEIN, URS: 1663b  
 BREITHAUPT, JOHANN F.: 328  
 BRESLAUER, S. DANIEL: 3150f  
 BRIEND, JACQUES: 931  
 BRIESSMANN, ADALBERT: 1609, 3105, 3325  
 BRINTON, CRANE: 1547g, 1554  
 BROCK, SEBASTIAN P.: 39, 783b, 783c, 3362c, 3536b  
 BROCKINGTON, LEONHARD H.: 643  
 BRODSKY, ALYN: 1092e  
 BRONKHORST, ALEXANDER J.: 891  
 BRONNER, LEAH: 2062, 2192, 2273, 2537  
 BROSHI, MAGEN: 1297f, 1599b, 1599c, 1635i, 3031f, 3112k  
 BROUGHTON, THOMAS ROBERT S.: 1169c, 1206a  
 BROWNE, LAURENCE E.: 875, 2155  
 BROWNE, LEWIS: 106  
 BROWNLEE, WILLIAM H.: 2480, 2543a  
 BRUCE, FREDERICK F.: 398a, 512, 821, 890, 1334, 1429d, 1488d, 1620b, 1984m, 1984p, 2338, 2357d, 2583d, 2774u, 2878, 3083b  
 BRUCE, I. A. F.: 1619  
 BRÜCKLMEIER, MAX: 1169b  
 BRÜLL, NEHEMIAH: 373  
 BRÜNE, BERNHARD: 461  
 BRUNT, PETER A.: 1547k  
 BUCHANAN, GEORGE W.: 2022m, 2242g, 2424, 2898d, 3319d  
 BUCHLER, ADOLPHE: see BÜCHLER  
 BUCHWALD, WOLFGANG: 571  
 BÜCHLER (BUCHLER), ADOLF (ADOLPHE, ADOLPH): 1000, 1888, 1949, 2142  
 BUEHLER, W. W.: 2251  
 BUITKAMP, JAN: 2406f, 2543u  
 BULHART, VINZENZ: 95, 178, 194  
 BULL, ROBERT J.: 2139m  
 BUNGE, J. G.: 1904d  
 BURCHARD, CHRISTOPHER (CHRISTOPH): 52, 84, 87e, 385, 2334d, 2395a, 2395f, 3350a  
 BURDACH, KONRAD: 1728  
 BURGMANN, HANS: 1102b, 1102c  
 BURKE, PETER: 3388a  
 BURKILL, T. A.: 2640a  
 BURKITT, FRANCIS C.: 2777  
 BURR, VIKTOR: 1189a, 1424  
 BURROWS, MILLAR: 2492, 2502  
 BURSTEIN, WILLIAM: 2621  
 BUSCEMI, MARCELLO: 3210b  
 BUSCH, FRITZ-OTTO (= CORNELISSEN, PETER): 1323, 1324  
 BUSINK, TH. A.: 1297b, 1857c, 1857p, 3020c  
 BYATT, ANTHONY: 1599  
 CADBURY, HENRY J.: 2830, 2874, 2886, 2891i  
 CAHAN, YA'AQOV: 3505  
 CAHN, WALTER: 198, 2021, 3359  
 CAILLOIS, ROGER: 1384  
 CALDERINI, ARISTIDE: 1408  
 CALMET, AUGUSTIN: 265, 266  
 CAMPBELL, EDWARD F.: 1934d, 2165c, 3160d  
 CAMPEAU, LUCIEN: 2879  
 VON CAMPENHAUSEN, HANS F.: 500  
 CANETTI, ELIAS: 425g  
 VAN CANGH, J. M.: 2000b  
 CANTALAMESSA, RANIERO: 2074j

- CAPELLE, BERNARD: 1652  
 CAPOCCI, VALENTINO: 1569  
 CARCOPINO, JÉRÔME: 2386  
 CARDAUNS, BURKHARDT: 990  
 CARDONA, GIORGIO R.: 311, 3455  
 CARLEBACH, A.: 1866*k*  
 CARMIGNAC, JEAN: 34*f*, 2074*b*, 2392*c*, 2471, 2543*zl*, 2626  
 CARMILLY-WEINBERGER, MOSHE: 474*b*, 3388*d*, 3430*a*  
 CARPZOV, JOHANN G.: 583  
 CARY, GEORGE A.: 3368, 3369  
 CASEY, P. M.: 824*g*  
 CASSIN, ELENA: 748  
 CASSUTO, UMBERTO: 268, 302  
 CASSUTO-SALZMANN, MILKA: 2933, 3223  
 CATCHPOLE, DAVID R.: 1277*a*, 1866*b*, 1948*e*, 1984*g*, 2825*h*, 2825*l*, 3259*a*  
 CAUSSIN, NICOLAS: 3545  
 CAVAGNAC, EUGÈNE: 1061  
 CAVALLETTI, SOFIA: 826  
 CAVALLIN, HANS C. C.: 1808*b*, 1808*c*  
 CAZELLES, HENRI: 2766  
 CELADA, B.: 2574  
 CHAMBERS, ROGER R.: 2093*j*  
 CHARLES, ROBERT H.: 1807, 2543*aa*  
 CHARLESWORTH, JAMES H.: 2309*c*, 2357*n*, 2543*zm*  
 CHARLESWORTH, MARTIN P.: 463  
 CHENDERLIN, FRITZ: 2074*h*  
 CHESTNUT, GLENN F.: 3261  
 CHIEL, ARTHUR A.: 68*b*  
 CHILTON, B. D.: 691*g*  
 CHRISTIDÈS, VASSILIOS: 676*k*, 3342*a*, 3353*b*  
 CHRISTIE, WILLIAM M.: 1563*j*, 3158*g*, 3173*d*  
 CHURGIN, PINKHOS: 415*a*, 544, 614, 1084*a*, 1084*i*, 1138*p*  
 CHWOLSON, DANIEL A.: 318  
 CHYLIŃSKI, HENRYK: 2348  
 CINTAS, PIERRE: 795  
 CLAES, ERNESTUS J.: 3476  
 CLARK, ALBERT C.: 2885  
 CLARK, KENNETH W.: 1910  
 CLARKE, N. P.: 3021  
 CLEMENTZ, HEINRICH: 134, 135, 136, 137  
 CLERMONT-GANNEAU, CHARLES: 1958  
 COBURN, OLIVER: 371*a*  
 COGGINS, R. J.: 2139*i*  
 COHEN, BOAZ: 2107*b*, 2107*c*, 2116*a*  
 COHEN, GERSON D.: 330, 342, 3451  
 COHEN, GETZEL M.: 968*c*, 1288  
 COHEN, JAKOB: 1064, 1919  
 COHEN, MARTIN A.: 1051, 1051*a*, 3457*b*  
 COHEN, NAOMI G.: 618, 641, 924, 1358, 1572, 3224, 3226, 3303, 3524, 3541  
 COHEN, SHAYE J. D.: 398, 403*b*, 441, 468, 488, 595, 625, 628, 1508, 1532, 1551, 1620, 1634, 1641, 1779, 2000, 2004, 2246, 2699, 2700, 2831, 3300, 3313, 3534, 3540  
 COHN, ERICH W.: 3020*b*  
 COHN, HAIM: 255, 1389*h*, 2052, 2097, 2114, 2765, 3353*c*  
 COHON, BERYL D.: 421  
 COHON, SAMUEL S.: 1794, 2235  
 COLACE, PAOLA RADICE: 1671*g*  
 COLEIRO, E.: 1265*e*  
 COLLINS, JOHN J.: 2170*j*  
 COLLINS, MARILYN F.: 2169  
 COLLOMP, PAUL: 571, 734  
 COLPE, CARSTEN: 1246, 1345, 2075  
 COLSON, FRANÓS H.: 1392, 1765, 1766, 1771, 2393  
 COMAY, JOAN: 565*g*  
 CONRAD, E.: 1563*e*  
 CONYBEARE, FREDERICK C.: 788  
 CONZELMANN, HANS: 565*y*, 933*ze*, 2751  
 COOK, MICHAEL J.: 2242*i*, 2774*zb*, 2891*o*, 2898*e*, 3207*a*  
 COOK, STANLEY A.: 831  
 COPPENS, JOSEPH: 1107*a*, 1980, 2543*zd*  
 CORBISHLEY, THOMAS: 905, 1252  
 CORBO, VIRGILIO: 2980, 2981, 2981*a*, 2981*b*, 3036*c*, 3036*e*  
 CORNELISSEN, PETER: see BUSCH, FRITZ-OTTO  
 CORNFELD, GAALYAHU: 565*b*, 886  
 CORRENS, DIETRICH: 2068  
 COUCHOUD, PAUL-LOUIS: 248  
 COURCELLE, PIERRE P.: 3355, 3358, 3360  
 COX, RAYMOND L.: 3112*a*  
 CRAPPS ROBERT W.: 1161, 2769  
 CRESPY, GEORGES: 2640*i*  
 CROCKETT, LARRIMORE: 2064*b*  
 CROOK, JOHN A.: 1496  
 CROSBY, HOWARD: 829  
 CROSS, FRANK M.: 772, 773, 774, 859, 1102, 1102*a*, 1138*b*, 1904*e*, 2146, 2147, 2162, 2170*a*, 2170*b*, 2341, 2410, 2428, 2543*i*  
 CROUCH, JAMES E.: 1647, 1771*l*, 2048*m*  
 CROUZEL, HENRI: 1338, 1339, 3350*c*  
 CROWFOOT, JOHN W.: 1290, 2166  
 CROWN, ALAN D.: 2139*h*, 2170*e*  
 CULLMAN, OSCAR: 2224, 2564, 2632, 2633, 2640*c*  
 CUMONT, FRANZ: 2385  
 CURTIUS, ERNST R.: 3342, 3403



- DĄBROWSKI, EUGENIUSZ: 172, 511, 2345, 2720d, 2891d  
 DAGUT, MERTON B.: 1183  
 DAHL, NILS A.: 1785  
 DAIN, A.: 3376  
 DALBERT, PETER: 1693, 1793  
 VAN DALE, ANTONIUS: 752, 941  
 DALY, ROBERT J.: 691f  
 DAN, JOSEPH: 3367c  
 DAN, YARON: 447a  
 DANCY, JOHN C.: 1002, 1010, 1065, 2067  
 DANE, CLEMENCE (= ASHTON, WINIFRED): 3489  
 DANIEL, CONSTANTIN: 2375, 2426, 2444, 2457, 2458, 2459, 2555, 2556, 2557, 2558, 2559, 2559a, 2559b, 2598, 2599  
 DANIEL, JERRY L.: 1084h  
 DANIEL, SUZANNE: 2040  
 DANIEL-ROPS, HENRI: 1155, 2185, 2774q, 2787  
 DANIELLOU, JEAN: 1750, 2395h, 2562c, 2720f, 2818h  
 DAOUST, JOSEPH: 1560  
 DAUBE, DAVID: 371d, 626d, 868c, 2055d, 2107e, 2119, 2322, 2911d, 3219r, 3307b  
 DAUTZENBERG, GERHARD: 824a, 1803v, 3219k  
 DAVIES, ARTHUR POWELL: 2493  
 DAVIES, G. I.: 744h, 744q  
 DAVIES, P. R.: 691g  
 DAVIES, PHILIP: 2392d  
 DAVIES, WILLIAM D.: 1969, 2210o, 2774zf, 2825o  
 DAVIS, L. H.: 2904  
 DAVIS, SIMON: 1481, 1782  
 DAVIS, WILLIAM HERSEY: 107  
 DEBEVOISE, NEILSON C.: 1342, 3322  
 DEBRUNNER, ALBERT: 62, 3229, 3241  
 DECKERT, BRIGITTE: 2170g  
 DELCOR, MATTHIAS: 691b, 691d, 1129, 1924, 2054c, 2151, 2160, 2305, 2306, 2429d, 2438, 2490, 2543j, 3033  
 DELLING, GERHARD: 34, 34a, 1786, 1789a, 1797a, 1982, 1990, 2096, 2826, 2932a, 3195, 3219b, 3219ze, 3513, 3524a  
 DEL MEDICO, HENRY (HENRI) E.: 322, 335, 354, 1099, 1187, 2081, 2358, 2359, 2360, 2370, 2631a, 2705a  
 DELTOMBE, F. LOUIS: 423, 1306  
 DEL VERME, MARCELLO: 2406d  
 DENIS, ALBERT-MARIE: 3352  
 DENTER, THOMAS: 833  
 DEPRAZ, LOUIS: 2873d  
 DEQUEKER, LUC: 2054f  
 DE QUINCEY, THOMAS: 2544  
 DERENBOURG, JOSEPH N.: 1897, 2293, 2368, 2460  
 DERRETT, JOHN DUNCAN M.: 2054h, 2716, 2873g, 3212b, 3219t  
 DE SANCTIS, GAETANO: 1092n  
 DESCAMPS, A.-L.: 1803ma  
 DESPINA, MARIE: 2242p  
 VON DESTINON, JUSTUS: 994, 1650  
 DETAYE, CYRILLE: 1097  
 DEUTSCH, GUY NAPHTALI: 565v, 3438f  
 DEVIR, YEHUDA: 3064, 3112i  
 DEVRESSE, ROBERT: 83, 1662, 3339  
 DEXINGER, FERDINAND: 676g, 2022g, 2139p, 2210v, 2299f  
 DHEILLY, JOSÈPHE: 522  
 DIBELIUS, MARTIN: 1647c, 2445a, 2730, 2877, 3253  
 DÍEZ MERINO, LUIZ: 1803r, 3219zf  
 DI LELLA, ALEXANDER A.: 824d  
 DIMITROVSKY, ZALMAN: 3091  
 DINKLER, ERICH: 3219zc  
 DINUR, BEN ZION: 376c, 3319e  
 DIPLOCK, P. RUSSELL: 2966, 2968c, 3162  
 DISENHOUSE, PHYLLIS: 13a  
 DITTMANN, WILHELM: 663, 1783  
 DÖRRIE, HEINRICH: 1658, 1663a  
 DOEVE, JAN WILLEM: 983c, 1857d, 1887, 1904b  
 DOMMERSHAUSEN, WERNER: 919j  
 DONAHUE, JOHN R.: 1169i  
 DONINI, AMBROGIO: 2774zh  
 DONNER, HERBERT: 1857h, 2969  
 DOR, SHIMON: 1358e, 1599g, 3173o, 3176f  
 DORNSEIFF, FRANZ: 985, 1691, 2790, 2802  
 DOWNEY, GLANVILLE: 955, 1489, 1492, 1615, 1616  
 DOWNING, F. GERALD: 625a, 747a, 949f, 1726b, 1726c, 2048r, 2891p, 2891q, 3259g  
 DOYLE, A. D.: 1391, 1743  
 DRAGUET, RENÉ: 261  
 DRAZIN, NATHAN: 2054b, 3236a  
 DREW, DOUGLAS L. M.: 1182, 3222  
 DREWS, ROBERT: 1671d  
 DREXLER, HANS: 442, 1552, 1611  
 DREYER, O.: 1803i  
 DRIOTON, ÉTIENNE: 732  
 DRIVER: GODFREY R.: 1058, 1522, 1933, 2532, 2535, 2595, 2669  
 DRÜNER, HANS: 993  
 DUBARLE, ANDRÉ-M.: 87d, 385d, 2724a, 2724f, 2774s, 2774y, 2817, 2817a, 2818d, 2818e, 2891k

- DUBNOW, SIMON M.: 1046  
 DuBUI, MICHEL: 1857, 1869  
 DUKER (FISHMAN-DUKER, DUKER-FISHMAN),  
   SARA R. (RIVKAH): 312, 331, 3379d, 3379e  
 DULIÈRE, WILLIAM L.: 2752  
 DULING, DENNIS C.: 820f  
 DuMESNIL DU BUISSON, ROBERT: 1916  
 DUNAND, M.: 1504  
 DUNAYEVSKY, I.: 3043  
 DUNKERLEY, RODERIC: 2745, 2774g  
 DUNLOP, DOUGLAS M.: 3449  
 DUPONT-SOMMER, ANDRÉ: 1186, 2226, 2328,  
   2330, 2387, 2392b, 2429g, 2470, 2477,  
   2478, 2479, 2536, 2543zn  
 DUPRAZ, LOUIS: 2873b  
 DURRY, MARCEL: 1612  
 DUVAL, YVES-MARIE: 828c  
 DUVENAGE, S.: 933u  
 DZIĘCIOL, WITOLD: 484, 940, 1604  
  
 ECK, WERNER: 3154, 3155  
 ECKHARD(US), TOBIAS: 2785  
 EDEL, ELMAR: 142  
 EDERSHEIM, ALFRED: 365, 382, 458, 602  
 EDSON, CHARLES: 958  
 EDWARDS, GEORGE R.: 2640r  
 EDWARDS, GEORGE W.: 1217  
 EFRON (EPHRON), YEHOASHUA (JOSHUA):  
   1051g, 1087, 1092ma, 1138n, 1189c, 1947,  
   1948c  
 EHRENBERG, VICTOR: 76a  
 EHRHARDT, ARNOLD: 1874, 2116b, 2883  
 EHRLICH, ERNST LUDWIG: 919a, 1488c,  
   1528c, 2242h, 2299e  
 EISENBERG, AZRIEL: 129a  
 EISLER, ROBERT: 59, 81, 208, 221, 239, 260,  
   407, 451, 1316, 2017, 2634, 2709, 2721,  
   2725, 2726, 2811, 2835, 3309, 3316  
 EISMAN, M. M.: 3336a  
 EISS, WERNER: 2055h  
 EISSFELDT, OTTO: 650  
 EK, SVEN: 1671da, 3240, 3276  
 ELLENSON, DAVID, 2242e  
 ELLER, MEREDITH F.: 1151, 2749  
 ELLIGER, KARL: 1095  
 ELLIS, EDWARD EARLE: 2357k, 2469a  
 ELLIS, OLIVER C. DE C.: 1307a  
 ELLISON, HENRY L.: 919h  
 ELON, MENAHEM: 2048n  
 ELTESTER, WALTHER: 1623  
 EMANUEL, YONAH: 1857m  
 EMERTON, JOHN A.: 854  
 EMONDS, HILARIUS: 3314  
  
 ENDRÖS, HERMANN: 139, 145  
 ENGBERG, ROBERT M.: 731  
 ENGLANDER, HENRY: 855  
 ENSLIN, MORTON S.: 2774r  
 EPHRON, JOSHUA: see EFRON  
 EPPSTEIN, VICTOR: 1873, 1911, 2323, 2326  
 EPSTEIN, JACOB (JAKOB) NAHUM: 2048k,  
   2064e, 2077a, 2082  
 EPSTEIN, LOUIS M.: 2106  
 ERNESTI, JOHANN AUGUST: 3267  
 ETTELSON, HARRY W.: 1006  
 EWALD, HEINRICH: 1270  
 EYBERS, IAN H.: 1387, 2149  
  
 FABER, TANAQUIL: 2782  
 FABER VAN DER MEULEN, HARRY E.: 820g,  
   3219o  
 FABRICIUS, JOHANN: 582  
 FALK, ZE'EV W.: 2048f  
 FARMER, WILLIAM R.: 115, 518, 1009o, 1317,  
   1540, 2195, 2583c, 2606, 2607, 2611, 2648,  
 FARRAR, FREDERIC W.: 1211  
 FARRÉ, LUIS: 159, 556, 1076  
 FASCHER, ERICH: 1378  
 FAST, HOWARD M.: 3487a  
 FAU, GUY: 1169sa, 2818a  
 FEINBERG, ADOLPH J.: 1214a  
 FELDMAN, LOUIS H.: 1a, 46, 64, 68, 68d, 72,  
   109, 119, 122, 126, 206, 480, 488e, 534, 554,  
   565u, 598, 600, 619, 661b, 667, 672, 681,  
   691b, 779, 782, 783, 783d, 787a, 820, 867,  
   907, 912, 933k, 933q, 1051p, 1074, 1254,  
   1322, 1341, 1360, 1367, 1374, 1390, 1430,  
   1445, 1446, 1459, 1462, 1470, 1472, 1594,  
   1644, 1702, 1733, 1774, 1775, 1792, 1803d,  
   1838, 1870, 1907, 1927, 1956, 2043, 2093i,  
   2124, 2132, 2227, 2260, 2264, 2277, 2313,  
   2327, 2476b, 2641, 2699c, 2706, 2722,  
   2774zd, 2838, 2900, 2910, 2911i, 2912,  
   2922, 2932c, 3051, 3072, 3103, 3198,  
   3200a, 3200b, 3200c, 3227, 3232, 3236,  
   3263, 3272, 3304  
 FERMEGLIA, GIUSEPPE: 213  
 FERNÁNDEZ, ANDRÉS: 843  
 FERRARI D'OCCHIEPPO, K.: 723g, 1803w,  
   2000c  
 FEUCHTWANGER, LION: 3466, 3467, 3468,  
   3469, 3470, 3471, 3472  
 FEUILLET, A.: 2724g, 2774za, 2790c, 2818f  
 FÉVRIER, JAMES-G.: 949e  
 FICHMAN, JACOB: 3488  
 FIEDLER, MARTIN J.: 3208  
 FIELDS, W. W.: 3266da

- FILLION, LOUIS C.: 2842  
 FILMER, W. E.: 1274  
 FILSON, FLOYD V.: 1157, 2758, 2959  
 FINCH, MATTHEW: 3487c  
 FINDLAY, ROBERT: 2786  
 FINEGAN, JACK: 661c, 744i, 933a, 1084e, 1273, 1301, 1563b, 1934b, 2825f, 2866, 2873a, 2957a, 2957m  
 FINKEL, ASHER: 653  
 FINKELSTEIN, LOUIS: 1081, 1885, 2239, 2262, 2263, 2268, 2286  
 FINLEY, MOSES I.: 120  
 FIORENZA, ELISABETH SCHÜSSLER: 2911g  
 FISCHEL, HENRY A.: 1009a, 1820, 2282, 2288, 3087, 3088  
 FISCHEL, WALTER J.: 3459  
 FISCHER, EUGENE: 1169t  
 FISCHER, J. B.: 1797  
 FISCHER, K.: 1088  
 FISCHER, THOMAS: 1063, 1091, 1092md, 1107h, 1169l, 1205, 1206g, 1904f  
 FISCHER, ULRICH: 1984k, 2022i  
 FISHER, LOREN R.: 820a, 1803t  
 FISHMAN-DUKER, RIVKAH: see DUKER  
 FITZGERALD, GERALD M.: 1148  
 FITZMYER, JOSEPH A.: 40, 59d, 675a, 820j, 1512d, 1798, 2885c, 3226c, 3235  
 FLEISHER, KANIYA: 23a  
 FLINDERS PETRIE, WILLIAM M.: 1915  
 FLUSSER, DAVID (GUSTAV): 191, 205, 267, 272, 273, 280, 281, 283, 287c, 287d, 294, 303, 306, 326, 327, 332, 347, 354b, 824b, 917, 1389k, 1398b, 1671h, 1789e, 1810, 1818e, 2210p, 2210q, 2276, 2286d, 2326d, 2522, 2818j, 3379b, 3452, 3457  
 FOAKES-JACKSON, FREDERICK J.: 472, 483, 2604, 2681  
 FOERSTER, GIDEON: 1825d, 2968e, 2984  
 FOERSTER, WERNER: 509, 892, 1147, 1219, 1227, 2343  
 FOHRER, GEORG: 34g  
 FONDA, ENIO A.: 2908  
 FORNARO, PIERPAOLO: 723m, 3331a  
 FRACCARO, PLINIO: 1432  
 FRANCIS, FRED O.: 1009i, 3529b  
 FRANK, HARRY T.: 919f, 3083c  
 FRANKEL, ZACHARIAS: 2366  
 FRANKFORT, THÉRÈSE: 1497, 1498  
 FRANSEN, IRÉNÉE: 2054e  
 FRANKMAN, THOMAS W.: 661g, 1771n  
 FRASER, PETER M.: 1703a  
 FRASSINETTI, PAOLO: 3337  
 FREEDMAN, DAVID N.: 812  
 FREILICH, YEHEZKEL: 3481  
 FREIMANN, ARON: 10, 200  
 FREND, WILLIAM H. C.: 1036, 2093e  
 FREUDENTHAL, JACOB: 1683, 1706, 2139l  
 FREY, JEAN-BAPTISTE: 1869d, 2084, 3517  
 FREYNE, SEAN: 398d, 403a, 933x, 1169sh, 2699a, 2699b, 2699d  
 FRÉZOULS, EDMOND: 3175  
 FRIEDBERG, BERNHARD (CHAIM D.): 3  
 FRIEDEN, ABTAI MARIA: 2429r  
 FRIEDRICH, GERHARD: 1262, 3201  
 FRIMER, DOV I.: 3132  
 FRITSCH, CHARLES T.: 39, 2334a, 2450, 2543c, 2968d  
 FROVA, ANTONIO: 1401, 1402  
 FRÜCHTEL, URSULA: 664, 1751, 1851  
 FRUIN, R.: 1199a  
 FRY, VIRGIL R. L.: 255d, 1866f  
 FUCHS, ALEXANDER: see FUKS  
 FUCHS, HARALD: 224  
 FUKS (FUCHS), ALEXANDER: 980, 1421, 1440, 1441, 1866l  
 FUKS, GIDEON: 1209e  
 FURNEAUX, RUPERT: 235, 1578  
 FURRER, KONRAD, 3173l  
 GABBA, EMILIO: 1508b  
 GAECHTER, PAUL: 1898, 1899  
 GÄRTNER, BERTIL: 581a, 1771b, 1803c, 2543d  
 GÄRTNER, HELGA: 3266  
 GAFNI, ISAIAH: 1009n, 1352a, 1352b, 1512b, 3307a  
 GAGÉ, JEAN: 1447, 2473  
 GAGER, JOHN G.: 744, 1698, 1701  
 GALLING, KURT: 142, 818, 1026, 1117, 1841, 1866g  
 GANCHO, C.: 520  
 GANDZ, SOLOMON: 972  
 GANN, ERNEST K.: 3482, 3509a  
 GARDINER, ALAN H.: 739  
 GAROFALO, SALVATORE: 1381  
 GARSON, R. W.: 1528  
 GARZETTI, ALBINO: 1347  
 GARZYA, ANTONIO: 96  
 GASQUE, W. WARD: 2891n  
 GASTER, MOSES: 2128  
 GASTER, THEODOR H.: 2139b  
 GASTON, LLOYD: 437, 1962, 2617  
 GAUGER, JÖRG-DIETER: 968b, 1092o  
 GAVIN, FRANK: 3543  
 GAVRON, DANIEL: 3487b  
 GELLER, M. J.: 1138m

- GELZER, MATTHIAS: 388, 1174, 1176, 1198, 1638  
 GENZ, GÜNTER: 3379  
 GEOLTRAIN, PIERRE: 2818g  
 GEORGACAS, DEMETRIUS J.: 3209  
 GEORGI, DIETER: 1761  
 GERHARDSSON, BIRGER: 2101a, 2326a, 3219a  
 GERLEMAN, GILLIS: 783a  
 GERRA, CARL B.: 1407  
 GESE, HARTMUT: 3172  
 GEVA, HILLEL: 3014f, 3031o  
 GIANGRANDE, GIUSEPPE: 99  
 GIBBS, JOHN G.: 3203e, 3283c  
 GIBLET, J.: 2690c  
 GICHON: see GIḤON  
 GIET, STANISLAS: 2896, 2897, 2898, 3243  
 GIḤON, MORDECAI: 425e, 1294, 1563o  
 GILAT, YITZHAK D.: 2048l  
 GILBOA, AKIVA: 1208, 1209, 1277b, 2050  
 GILKES, ANTHONY N.: 2523  
 GINSBURG, CHRISTIAN D.: 2335, 2367  
 GINSBURG, MICHAEL S.: 984  
 GINZBERG, LOUIS: 605, 668, 686, 1754, 2053, 2054g, 2173, 2231, 2304, 2461, 2543y  
 GIOVANNI, ADALBERTO: 1206e  
 GIRARD, LOUIS: 1382, 2859  
 GIROD, ROBERT: 2825i  
 GLANZMAN, GEORGE S.: 40  
 GLASER, EDWARD: 3427a  
 GLASSON, THOMAS FRANCIS: 676c, 2022a, 2429a  
 GLATZER, NAHUM N.: 28, 29, 111, 112, 114, 415, 558, 1169sb, 1984n, 2210e, 3547  
 VON GLISZCZYNSKI, S.: 1905  
 GLUECK, NELSON: 2958, 2960, 3032, 3157a  
 GLUMAC, DUŠAN: 175  
 GNILKA, JOACHIM: 2422, 2437, 2640j, 2720n  
 GOETHALS, AGOSTINO: 243, 2729  
 GOGUEL, MAURICE: 2821  
 GOLAN, DAVID: 940f  
 GOLB, NORMAN: 2554  
 GOLDBERG, A. M.: 697a  
 GOLDENBERG, DAVID: 488d, 601e, 2048i, 2048j, 3291e, 3539a  
 GOLDIN, JUDAH: 36, 513, 933c, 1971, 2275  
 GOLDSCHMIDT, LAZARUS: 361  
 GOLDSTEIN, JONATHAN A.: 824, 919, 983, 991f, 1009, 1016, 1016a, 1051n, 1092, 1716d, 1731, 3226b  
 GOLDSTEIN, MORRIS: 2740  
 GOLDSTEIN, SIDNEY: 2120d, 3150b  
 GOLDWURM, HERSH: 1051o  
 GOMME, ARNOLD W.: 3531  
 GONZÁLES ECHEGARAY, JOAQUÍN: 1239, 1605c  
 GOODBLATT, DAVID: 2246b, 2314a  
 GOODE, ALEXANDER D.: 275a  
 GOODENOUGH, ERWIN R.: 45, 59f, 928, 1490, 1732, 1752, 1755, 1756, 1828, 1829, 2042, 2083, 2085, 2253, 2310, 2433, 3520  
 GOODHART, HOWARD L.: 59f, 1732  
 GOODMAN, HANNAH G.: 129a  
 GOODSPEED, EDGAR J.: 3293  
 GOOLD, G. P.: 1730  
 GOOSSENS, ROGER: 1179, 1950, 1951, 2481  
 GOPPELT, LEONHARD: 1528b, 2210c  
 GORANSON, S.: 2456b  
 GORBACH, JOSEF: 2962  
 GORDIS, ROBERT: 3090, 3135, 3140, 3495  
 GOREN, SHLOMO: 3127  
 GORMLY, SISTER FRANCIS: 3425  
 GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN, MOSHE H.: see GOTTSTEIN  
 GOTTSTEIN (GOSHEN-GOTTSTEIN), MOSHE H.: 2491  
 VAN GOUDOEVER, J.: 2055g  
 GOUKOWSKY, PAUL: 565q  
 GOURGUES, MICHEL: 2640t  
 GOWAN, DONALD E.: 919m, 2543z, 2690h, 2705f  
 GRABBE, LESTER L.: 601b, 824e, 1984l  
 GRAETZ, HEINRICH: 404  
 GRAF, GEORG: 359, 3458  
 GRAF, HEINZ R.: 438a  
 GRAF, MARY R.: 723j  
 GRAFMAN, R.: 1297, 2999  
 GRANT, FREDERICK C.: 1152, 1160  
 GRANT, MICHAEL: 561, 565z, 914, 1263, 1307d, 1517  
 GRANT, ROBERT M.: 85, 933l, 1389g, 1968, 1987, 2210i, 2720r, 2774j, 2774zc, 2825n, 3350b, 3351, 3353e  
 GRASS, KONRAD: 219  
 DE GRASSI, ATTILIO: 1406  
 GRATSEAS, GEORGIOS: 1242, 2357f  
 GRAY, BARBARA C.: 1563f  
 GRAY, JOHN: 906, 1253, 1302, 1307, 1425, 1547, 2287  
 GRAY, ROBERT: 2833  
 GREENBERG, MOSHE: 649, 828, 1354  
 GREGOR, DOUGLAS B.: 3291  
 GREIG, JAMES C. G.: 1052  
 GRELOT, PIERRE: 336, 744o, 1984v, 2022k, 2406, 2690e  
 GRIFFITH, GUY T.: 31, 1471  
 GRIFFITHS, JOHN GWYN: 433, 1965, 2640m  
 GRIMM, CARL L. W.: 1659

- GRIMM, WERNER: 1824, 1904  
 GRINTZ, JEHOShUA (YEHOSHUA, JOSHUA)  
     M.: 1206l, 1875, 1879, 2483, 2516, 3293a,  
     3294, 3295  
 GROAG, EDMUND: 1452, 3523  
 GROH, DENNIS E.: 2957k, 3173m  
 GROSS, E.: 2441  
 GROSS, WILLIAM J.: 1234  
 GRUBER, J.: 183  
 GRUNDMAN, WALTER: 144, 1787, 2865  
 GRY, LEON: 1590  
 GRYGLEWICZ, FELIKS: 922, 1032  
 GUDZII, NIKOLAI K.: 225, 238, 3441  
 GÜTING, EBERHARD: 2055a  
 GUEVARA, H.: 1169sk  
 GUIGNEBERT, CHARLES: 1162, 2774d  
 GUILLAUMONT, ANTOINE: 2429q, 2815  
 GUILLET, JACQUES: 2640k  
 GUILLET, P.-E.: 1138g  
 GULAK, ASHER: 2109  
 GUNTHER, JOHN J.: 2898c  
 GUSTAFSSON, B.: 3345  
 GUTBROD, WALTER: 3211, 3213  
 GUTERMAN, SIMEON L.: 1202, 1485  
 GUTMAN, JOSHUA: see GUTMANN  
 GUTMAN, LEO: 3093  
 GUTMAN, SHMARYAHU (SHMARYAH): 3040,  
     3043, 3049, 3173na  
 GUTMANN, JOSEPH: 1627, 1854, 2092, 3431  
 GUTMANN (GUTMAN, GUTTMANN), JOSHUA  
     (YEHOSHUA): 565c, 588, 919c, 935, 983b,  
     991e, 1675, 2111  
 VON GUTSCHMID, ALFRED: 1343  
 GUTTMANN, ALEXANDER: 1912, 2242zf  
 GUTTMANN, HEINRICH: 471, 2036  
 GUTTMANN, YEHOSHUA: see GUTMANN
- HAACKER, KLAUS: 723, 3219t  
 HAAG, HERBERT: 59e, 2074e  
 HACHLILI, RACHEL: 2988d  
 HADAS, MOSES: 545, 943, 949, 987, 1738,  
     2388, 2405, 3270, 3389  
 HADDAD, GEORGE M.: 952  
 HAGGAI, SHMUEL: 149  
 HAHN, FERDINAND: 1803g, 2449a, 2583b,  
     2640b, 2755, 2818m, 2885a  
 HAHN, ISTVAN (S.): 168, 436, 1235, 1283,  
     1284b, 1819, 1959, 1961, 1964, 2443, 2527  
 HAILPERIN, HERMAN: 3385  
 HAIMI-COHN, AVINOAM: 3065  
 HAINCHELIN, CHARLES: 2774b  
 HALÉVY, MEYER A.: 699
- HALEVY (RABINOWITZ), YITZHAK I.: 392,  
     1371, 2232, 3547  
 HAMBURGER, JACOB: 366, 585  
 HAMMERSCHMIDT, ERNST: 1312  
 HAMMOND, PHILIP C.: 3157d  
 HAMPEL, IDO: 840  
 HAMRICK, EMMET W.: 3008, 3014k, 3014n  
 HANHART, ROBERT: 661b, 868a, 1016b  
 HANKOFF, LEON D.: 425c, 2120, 2120a,  
     2120b, 2120c, 3150e  
 HANSEN, GÜNTHER C.: 3338  
 HANSEN, PETER A.: 21a  
 HANSLIK, RUDOLF: 1467  
 HANSON, A.: 1758  
 HARAN, MENAHEM: 1934c, 2165b, 3160c  
 HARDER, GÜNTHER: 1292  
 HARE, DOUGLAS R. A.: 1563a, 2825e  
 HAR-EL, MENASHE: 2949, 2973  
 HARLAN, R. E.: 1320  
 HARLOW, VICTOR E.: 1330  
 HARPER, GEORGE M.: 970  
 HARRINGTON, DANIEL J.: 34d, 675a, 685,  
     722, 780, 781, 820j, 1512d, 2885c, 3226c  
 HARRIS, HAROLD A.: 2093h  
 HARRIS, ROBERT LAIRD: 652  
 HARRISON, ROLAND K.: 2349, 2517  
 HART, HENRY ST. J.: 3181  
 HART, JOHN H. A.: 514  
 HARTMAN, LOUIS F.: 824d  
 HARTMANN, LARS: 824h, 1803md, 2022l  
 DE HASS, CARL: 3504  
 HATA, GOHEI: 170d, 170e, 170f, 170g, 170h,  
     170i, 170j, 824f, 1605f, 1803mb, 1818d,  
     1904j, 1984o, 3212e, 3259e, 3298a  
 HAUDE, WALDEMAR: 2957  
 HAVELKA, JAROSLAV: 163  
 HAVERCAMP, SIGEBERTUS (SYVERT): 3315  
 HAY, DAVID M.: 1647f, 1771k  
 HAYMAN, ALLISON P.: 206c, 3362b, 3526a  
 HEBBEL, FRIEDRICH: 3488  
 Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of  
     Religion: 5  
 HEGERMANN, HARALD: 446, 563, 923  
 HEICHELHEIM, FRITZ M.: 919o, 2848  
 HEINEMANN, ISAAK: 542, 608, 609, 726, 1022,  
     1084, 1084a, 1084b, 1740, 1741, 1742,  
     1769, 1986, 2039, 2911b, 3239  
 HEINEMANN, JOSEPH: 710, 744p, 1776  
 HEINEN, HEINZ: 1488f  
 HELBING, ROBERT: 3284  
 HELCK, HANS WOLFGANG: 709, 740  
 HELFGOTT, SAMSON: 1188, 2064  
 HELLER, BERNARD: 3084

- HELLER, BERNHARD: 606, 607  
 HELM, RUDOLF: 466  
 HELTZER, MICHAEL: 859a  
 HEMPEL, JOHANNES: 2518  
 HENDIN, DAVID: 3192f  
 HENGEL, MARTIN: 626a, 626e, 871, 926, 933j, 991d, 1047, 1671c, 1825b, 2054i, 2196, 2354, 2392, 2569, 2582, 2618, 2640, 2660, 2690, 2692, 3148  
 HENNING, D.: 1488r  
 HENRICHS, ALBERT: 1618  
 HENTSCHE, RICHARD: 505  
 HEPP, NOÉMI: 3402a  
 HERFORD, ROBERT TRAVERS: 1984t, 2218  
 HERR, MOSHE D.: 2059, 3254, 3319f  
 HERRMANN, LÉON: 255c, 385b, 385c, 949a, 1336, 1366b, 1635a, 2720, 2774o, 2825k, 2892  
 HERST, ROGER E.: 425d  
 HERZBERG, ABEL J.: 1220, 3492  
 HERZBERG, YITZHAK: 3480  
 HERZFELD, LEVI: 1178  
 HERZOG, ISAAC H.: 371b, 376b, 425b, 2048d  
 HEYKE, WALTRAUT: 3266  
 HEYOB, SHARON K.: 2100c  
 HIDEMURA, KINJI: 170c, 1528a, 1579b  
 HILDESHEIMER, ISRAEL (AZRIEL): 1857e  
 HILGENFELD, ADOLF: 2376  
 HILGERT, EARLE: 47, 48, 48a, 48b, 48c, 48d, 1734, 1735, 1735a, 1735b, 1735c, 1735d  
 HILL, DAVID: 2022n, 2702a, 2720v, 2790d, 2885d  
 HILL, DOROTHY K.: 979, 3160  
 HILLESUM, M. S.: 12  
 HIRANUMA, TOSHIO: 170c  
 HIRSCH, HERBERT: 1207e  
 HIRSCH, LEVIE: 12  
 HITTE, JEAN: 3112b  
 HITTI, PHILIP K.: 956, 957  
 HJERL-HANSEN, BØRGE: 3173j  
 HOBBSAWM, E. J.: 1547n  
 HÖCHERL, ALFONS: 230  
 HOEHNER, HAROLD W.: 1272, 1335, 2694, 2891h  
 HÖLSCHER, GUSTAV: 464, 597, 612, 627, 676b, 746, 835, 849, 995, 1630, 1667, 1709, 1816, 1872, 2131, 2215, 2230, 2320, 3163  
 HOENIG, SIDNEY B.: 60, 345, 1846, 1940, 1943, 2058, 2099, 2285, 2610, 2670, 2673, 3092, 3142, 3144, 3147, 3153  
 HÖRANDMER, W.: 87a  
 HOFFMANN, DAVID: 1948f  
 HOFFMANN, PAUL: 2210f, 2406b  
 HOFIUS, OTFRIED: 2898b, 3219zb  
 HOHEISEL, KARL: 565w, 643c, 2210r  
 HOLLADAY, CARL R.: 626b, 705a, 3266c  
 HOLLEAUX, MAURICE: 1051e  
 HOLMES, THOMAS RICE E.: 1199  
 HOLTZ, TRAUGOTT: 2720g  
 HOLTZMANN, OSCAR: 1830  
 HOLZMEISTER, URBAN: 1141  
 HOMINER, HAYIM: 278, 295  
 HOMMEL, HILDEBRECHT: 3212c  
 HOMO, LEON: 1606  
 HOPFNER, THEODOR: 1072  
 HORN, SIEGFRIED H.: 714  
 HORNING, ERIK: 744c, 820b  
 HORSLEY, RICHARD A.: 1547m, 2690f, 2690g  
 VAN DER HORST, P. W.: 1647k, 2818k, 3286b  
 HORTON, FRED L.: 691c  
 HORVÁTH, ISTVÁN K.: 2793, 2799  
 HORVATH, P.: 2380  
 HOSPERS-JANSEN, ANNA M. A.: 1585, 3324  
 HOWARD, GEORGE E.: 634, 777, 778  
 HOWLETT, DUNCAN: 1138a  
 HRUBY, KURT: 1825c  
 HUBBARD, BENJAMIN J.: 2891l  
 HUBBARD, R. PEARCE S.: 3001b  
 HUBER, WOLFGANG: 2074c  
 HÜBNER, HANS: 2429l  
 HUET, PIERRE DANIEL: see HUETIUS  
 HUETIUS (HUET), PIERRE DANIEL: 2784  
 HÜTTENMEISTER, FROWALD: 1866i  
 HUGHES, PHILIP E.: 568, 570  
 HURD, JOHN C., JR.: 2a  
 HUSCHKE, PHILIPP E.: 2849  
 HUSSEY, S. S.: 3396  
 HUTEAU-DUBOIS, LUCETTA: 3069  
 HYATT, JAMES PHILIP: 813  
 HYLDAHL, NIELS: 3344  
 ILAN, ZVI: 3070  
 ILIFFE, JOHN H.: 1859  
 INGHOULT, HARALD: 1269, 1271  
 INOUE, HAJIME: 933b, 1265c  
 INSTINSKY, HANS U.: 1621, 2862, 2873b  
 IRMSCHER, JOHANNES: 2167  
 ISAAC, B. H.: 1563i  
 ISAAC, JULES: 1073  
 ISAACS, MARIE E.: 3219y  
 ISAKSSON, ABEL: 2429h  
 ISENBERG, SHELDON R.: 3319c  
 ISRAEL, GÉRARD: 1577  
 ISSER, STANLEY J.: 2139g, 2476a  
 ISTRIN, VIKTOR M.: 209, 220, 237

- ITURBE, J. C.: 2413  
 IWRY, SAMUEL: 2429e
- JACK, JAMES W.: 251  
 JACKSON, BERNARD S.: 1771h, 2048g, 2116c, 2116d  
 JACOBSON, DAVID M.: 1857o  
 JACOBSON, HOWARD: 1676a  
 JACOBY, FELIX: 445, 1687, 1692  
 JAEGER, WERNER: 1679, 1680  
 JAHN, WERNER: 3474  
 JANSEN, HERMAN LUDIN: 1028  
 JAROŠ, KARL: 2170f, 2170g, 3014i  
 JAUBERT, ANNIE: 1796, 2631b  
 JAVIERRE, A. M.: 3219x  
 JAY, B.: 933t, 2210s  
 JELlicoe, SIDNEY: 39, 756, 761  
 JEREMIAS, JOACHIM: 378, 1156, 1595, 1596, 1867, 2139c, 2219, 2524, 2891b, 3226a  
 JERVELL, JACOB: 665, 1331  
 JESELSON, DAVID: 1138o  
 JOEL, ISSACHAR: 22  
 JOHANNESSEN, EGON H.: 832  
 JOHN, WALTHER: 1318  
 JOHNS, ALGER F.: 2060  
 JOHNS, CEDRIC N.: 3002, 3024, 3025  
 JOHNSON, BO: 760, 3535  
 JOHNSON, MARSHALL D.: 676i  
 JOHNSON, PAUL: 933v, 2210k, 2720p  
 JONES, ARNOLD H. M.: 76a, 494, 495, 1194, 1215, 1285, 1420, 2091, 2936  
 JONES, TOM B.: 526  
 DE JONG, H. W. M.: 1803s  
 DE JONGE, MARINUS (MARIANUS): 1319, 1984, 2030, 2031  
 JONGELING, BASTIAAN: 54  
 JORDAN, RUTH: 565i, 1508a  
 JOST, ISAAC M.: 2608  
 JOST, MARCUS: 474b  
 JÓZWIĄK, FRANCISZEK: 2423  
 JUNG, H.: 1464  
 JUSTER, JEAN: 27  
 JUSTUS, BERNHARD: 3249
- KADMAN, LEO: 1531, 2965  
 KÄSEMANN, ERNST: 2309b  
 KAHLE, PAUL E.: 767  
 KAHN-JASHAR, JOHANAN: 1078  
 KAHRSTEDT, ULRICH: 1346  
 KAKRIDES, JOHANNES T.: see KAKRIDIS  
 KAKRIDIS (KAKRIDES), JOHANNES (IOHANNES) T.: 1303, 3242
- KALLAI (KLEINMANN), ZECHARIA(H): 750, 2941, 2951  
 KALLANDER, DEAN C.: 2031b  
 KALLISTOV, DMITRII P.: 2334c  
 KAMIL, MURAD: 362  
 KAMINKA, AHARON (ARMAND): 379, 390, 399, 412, 419, 543, 1722, 1952, 2037, 2280, 2281, 3086  
 KAMLAH, EHRHARD: 1789, 1827  
 KAMP, HENRY W.: 1515  
 KANAEL, BARUCH: 1115, 1116, 1190, 1266, 1530, 3178, 3192e  
 KANDLER, HANS J.: 2494  
 KANE, J. P.: 1869c  
 KAPERA, Z. J.: 3075  
 KAPLAN, JACOB: 1108, 1109, 3173h  
 KARLIN, A.: 1954  
 KARPP, HEINRICH: 944  
 KARRER, OTTO: 2920  
 KARS, H. W.: 241, 2728  
 KASCHNITZ VON WEINBERG, GUIDO: 1620a  
 KASHER, ARYEH (ARIE, ARIÉ): 744d, 744e, 940d, 1070f, 1070g, 1169sl, 1488i, 1488j, 1488k, 1488l, 1488m, 1488n, 1492b, 2139j, 2968i  
 KAST, ALVIN: 129a  
 KASTING, HEINRICH: 2911f, 2918a, 2932b  
 KATZ, BEN-ZION: 2172, 2735  
 KATZ (WALTERS), PETER: 643a, 651, 768  
 KATZENSTEIN, HANS JACOB: 791, 792, 1876  
 KAUFMAN, REUBEN: 2353  
 KAUFMANN, YEHEZKEL: 2011, 2023  
 KAZIS, ISRAEL J.: 3450  
 KEDAR, BENJAMIN: 3083e, 3511c  
 KEE, HOWARD C.: 123, 2164, 2772  
 KELLERMANN, ULRICH: 847  
 KELLEY, TERESA M.: 3393c  
 KELLY, MARY: 2242r  
 KELSO, JAMES L.: 2452, 2514, 2987  
 KENNARD, JOSEPH SPENCER, JR.: 253, 1945, 2701, 2736, 2779, 2805  
 KENYON, KATHLEEN M.: 1290, 1297a, 2166, 2994, 3001h, 3001j, 3007, 3014g, 3014j  
 KERAMOPOULLOS, ANTON: 2073  
 KESTENBERG-GLADSTEIN, RUTH: 3388b  
 KIEVAL, PHILIP: 1090  
 KILPATRICK, GEORGE D.: 2825c, 2895  
 KIMBROUGH, S. T.: 2064a  
 KIMHI, ISRAEL: 3001n, 3001o  
 KINDLER, ARYEH: 1327a, 3192g  
 KINGDON, H. PAUL: 2578, 2603, 2680  
 KIPPENBERG, HANS G.: 919l, 933w, 1703c, 2139o, 2154

- KIPPER, BALDUINO: 1662a  
 KIRSCHENBAUM, AARON: 1277, 1955, 2116  
 KISCH, GUIDO: 3381, 3382, 3383, 3384, 3384a  
 KITOWSKY, ISAIAH: 2590  
 KITTEL, GERHARD: 1169t, 2107a, 2139a, 2911a, 3201  
 KLASSEN, WILLIAM: 2639  
 KLAUSNER, JOSEPH (JOSEF): 385f, 414, 1029, 1030, 1138q, 1051k, 1216, 1562, 1597, 2013, 2206, 2210y, 2220, 2446, 2566, 2619, 2620, 2642, 2643, 2644, 2645, 2659, 2703, 2774zg, 2825p, 2914, 2921  
 KLEIN, SAMUEL: 2945, 2948, 2950  
 KLEINER, GERHARD: 1625  
 KLEINMANN, ZECHARIAH: see KALLAI  
 KLIJN, ALBERTUS F. J.: 676f  
 KLINZING, GEORG: 2395e, 2418d  
 KNOX, WILFRED L.: 1771a, 1803b, 1803n, 2357a, 2857, 2876  
 KOBLER, FRANZ: 3259d  
 KOCH, WERNER: 1389d, 2774k  
 KOCIS, ELEMÉR: 2022e  
 KÖHLER, AUGUST: 2882  
 KÖSTERMANN, ERICH: 1363, 1411  
 KOHLER, KAUFMANN: 2334e, 2369, 2379, 2563  
 KOLB, LEON: 3485, 3486  
 KOLITZ, ZVI: 3128  
 KOLLEK, TEDDY: 3001e  
 KON, MAXIMILIAN: 1622, 3022  
 KOPP, CLEMENS: 2954  
 KOPYLENKO, MOISEI M.: 217  
 KOSMALA, HANS: 2551  
 KOSSOFF, DAVID: 3483  
 KOTKER, NORMAN: 1160, 2995  
 KOTTEK, HEIMANN: 206d  
 KRAABEL, ALF THOMAS: 968e, 1492e, 1492f  
 KRAELING, CARL H.: 953, 1395, 1491, 1617, 2710, 2977  
 KRAFT, ROBERT A.: 676h, 771, 3203b, 3524b  
 KRANSEN, HARRY JERRY: 1547j  
 KRAUS, CLARA: 1486  
 KRAUSS, SAMUEL: 820i, 3205, 3379a, 3388f  
 KRAWCZUK, ALEKSANDER: 1243, 1265j, 1307b  
 KRAWCZYŃSKI, STAMATIA: 3353  
 KREISSIG, HEINZ: 1034, 1169q, 1545, 1546, 1550, 2190  
 KRENKEL, MAX: 2891j  
 KRIEGER, NORBERT: 2893  
 KRIJBOLDER, P.: 2774w  
 KRULL, EVA: 216  
 KRUPP, MICHAEL: 1092c, 1138h, 2055b  
 KRUSE, HEINZ: 2472  
 KUBIAK, ZYGMUNT: 172  
 KÜCHLER, MAX: 1771o, 2048q  
 KÜMMEL, WERNER G.: 2093a  
 KUHN, KARL G.: 1579c, 2430, 2508, 2903  
 KUIJPER, DIRK: 3430  
 KUITERT, H. M.: 2640q  
 KUNKEL, WOLFGANG: 1302b  
 KUTSCH, ERNST: 2440  
 LABIB, PAHOR C.: 729  
 LACHS, SAMUEL TOBIAS: 1051b, 2720s  
 LACOCQUE, ANDRÉ: 824i, 1051m  
 LADOUCEUR, DAVID J.: 488a, 1315a, 1352e, 1352f, 1635e, 1726a, 1726d, 3112j, 3119d, 3203c, 3252c, 3283b  
 LÄMMER, MANFRED: 1288a, 1288b, 1340a, 2093f, 2093g  
 DE LAET, SIEGFRIED J.: 1416  
 LAGERKVIST, PÄR FABIAN: 3478  
 LAGRANGE, MARIE-JOSEPH A.: 385a, 2222, 2720a, 2850  
 LAINER, Y.: 3445  
 LAISTNER, MAX L. W.: 3374b, 3374c  
 LAKE, KIRSOPP: 2604, 2681  
 LAMADRID, ANTONIO GONZÁLES: 59a, 2495  
 LAMARCHE, PAUL: 3219n  
 LAMDAN, YIZHAK: 3496  
 LANDAU, YEHUDA H.: 1062  
 LANE, WILLIAM L.: 1966, 2027, 2616, 2704  
 LANG, FRIEDRICH G.: 3176g  
 DE LANGE, NICHOLAS: 3350d  
 LANGEVIN, PAUL-ÉMILE: 21c  
 LAPEROUSAZ, ERNEST-MARIE: 2357i, 3001p, 3014c, 3031h  
 LAPIDE, PINCHAS: 3291c  
 LAPP, PAUL W.: 978, 2163, 3160b  
 LAQUEUR, RICHARD: 386, 406, 440, 449, 470, 474b, 725, 1248, 1500, 1636, 1711, 1712, 2776, 3108, 3230, 3275, 3308  
 LARAYA, JUAN A. G.: 157  
 LARSEN, JAKOB A. O.: 2854  
 LARSON, MARTIN A.: 2334b, 2560, 2560a  
 LA SOR, WILLIAM S.: 51, 104, 2496, 2509  
 LASSALLE, STANISLAS: 1015, 1035, 1931  
 LASSERRE, F.: 3252e  
 LATTKE, MICHAEL: 1803mc  
 LAUFFRAY, JEAN: 1436, 3174  
 LAURAND, LOUIS A.: 552  
 LAUTERBACH, JACOB Z.: 1984u  
 LA VERDIERE, E. A.: 3076  
 LAWLOR, JOHN I.: 1358b  
 LAZZARATO, DAMIANUS: 2839  
 LEANEY, ALFRED R. C.: 991a, 1169r, 2864  
 LEBAR, JACQUES: 1577



- LEBRAM, JÜRGEN C. H.: 657, 2009  
 LE DÉAUT, ROGER: 638, 691e, 713, 1776a, 3306  
 LEDER, HANS-G.: 666  
 LEEMING, BERNARD: 2813  
 LÉGASSE, S.: 1825f  
 LEHMANN, JOHANNES: 2562b  
 LEHMANN, JOSEPH: 1953  
 LEIKIND, MIRIAM: 23  
 LEIMAN, SID Z.: 659, 661e  
 LEIPOLDT, JOHANNES: 144, 661a, 2117  
 LÉMONON, J.-P.: 1389j  
 LE MOYNE, JEAN: 2236, 2318  
 LENKOWSKI, STANISLAW: 171  
 LENTZEN-DEIS, FRITZLEO: 1909a, 2720m  
 LEON, HARRY J.: 1365, 2901, 2925, 3519  
 LERLE, ERNST: 2902  
 LERSCH, DAVID: 691  
 LESHEM, HAYIM: 374  
 LESKY, ALBIN: 559  
 LESZYNSKY, RUDOLF: 2242t, 2319  
 LETTOFSKY, ALAN: 426, 1521, 2019  
 LEUTY, STANLEY G.: 485, 2773  
 LEVENSON, EDWARD R.: 467, 1004, 1086, 1172, 1720, 3107  
 LEVEY, IRVING M.: 2968f  
 LEVINE, HARRY O. H.: 2048b, 2054a, 3539  
 LEVINE, LEE I. (ISRAEL LEE) (A.): 1137, 1297e, 2055f, 2299b, 2583f, 2967, 2967a, 2968, 2968a, 2968k, 2968l  
 LEVINSOHN, JOSHUA: 1563  
 LEVY, FELIX A.: 493  
 LÉVY, ISIDORE: 805, 864, 1012, 1066, 1313, 1767, 1768, 2384, 2395c, 2395d  
 LEVY, MARVIN DAVID: 3498a  
 LEWIS, BERNARD: 3083f, 3498b, 3511e  
 LEWIS, DAVID M.: 3518  
 LEWIS, JACK P.: 675  
 LEWIS, THEODORE N.: 415b, 1084k  
 LEWY, HANS (JOHANAN): 154, 352, 1588, 1620c, 1620d, 1672, 1690, 2000a, 2299a, 3310, 3380  
 LEWY, HILDEGARDE: 1350  
 LEYTENS, J.: 2351  
 LICHT, JACOB: 1063a, 1138l, 2398, 2543zb  
 LICHTENSTEIN, HANS: 2298  
 LIDA DE MALKIEL, MARIA ROSA: 161, 3370, 3406, 3412, 3413, 3414, 3415, 3416, 3417, 3418, 3419, 3420, 3421, 3422, 3423, 3427b, 3427c  
 LIEBERMAN, SAUL: 929, 1458, 1842, 1902, 1906, 2118, 2289, 2290, 2307, 2462, 2486, 2691, 3089, 3095  
 LIEBMAN-FRANKFORT, THÉRÈSE: 1043  
 LIFSHITZ, BARUCH: 1405, 1863, 2928, 2968j, 3001k, 3173f, 3228, 3517a  
 LIGHTFOOT, JOHN: 2374  
 LIGHTSTONE, JACK: 2326g  
 LIND, MILLARD C.: 2008  
 LINDBLOM, JOHANNES: 1984e  
 LINDESKOG, GÖSTA: 50, 255b, 2350, 2519, 2774a  
 LINDJER, CORD H.: 1806  
 LINDNER, HELGO: 581d, 1629, 1632, 1803, 1817, 2242o, 3111, 3119, 3258  
 LINDNER, MANFRED: 3157b  
 LINDSAY, JACK: 1209b, 1307c  
 LINTON, OLOF: 669  
 LIPIŃSKI, EDUARD: 820d  
 LIVER, JACOB: 790, 1847, 2026, 2150, 2158  
 LIVNEH, MICAH: 3062, 3063  
 Livraria Ets Haim: 11  
 LODDER, WILLEM: 473  
 LOEWE, HERBERT M. J.: 1103  
 LOEWENSTAMM, SAMUEL E.: 711, 712  
 LOFFREDA, STANISLAW: 2996, 3173v  
 LOFTUS, FRANCIS: 398b, 1731b, 2697a, 2698, 2698a  
 LOHSE, BERNHARD: 2429j  
 LOHSE, EDUARD: 34h, 565f, 1369, 1488h, 1818b, 2210j, 2530  
 VAN DER LOOS, HENDRIK: 244, 2732, 2959  
 LORD, JAMES R.: 682  
 LOSADA, D.: 2720t  
 LOSADA, J.: 2774  
 LOWY, S.: 2139n  
 LOZOVAN, E.: 2474, 2475, 2476  
 LUCREZI, F.: 2031a  
 LUDWIG, EMIL: 1307g  
 LÜHRMANN, DIETER: 2890, 3218  
 LUGANS, GEORGES: 3000  
 LUKÁCS, GEORG (GYÖRGY): 3473  
 LUMPE, ADOLF: 181  
 LUNDSTRÖM, SVEN: 98, 192, 206b  
 LURIA, BEN-ZION: see LURIE  
 LURIE (LURIA), BEN-ZION: 1037, 1092g, 1092l, 1107, 1107c, 1107d, 1120, 1121, 1138d, 1225, 1226, 1257, 1265f, 1492a, 1716f, 1826, 1857k, 1864, 1929, 2296, 3014e, 3031e, 3031i  
 LUTTERBECK, JOHANN A. B.: 1746  
 LUX, UTE: 3013  
 LUZ, MENAHEM: 1676b, 3119e  
 LYONS, WILLIAM N.: 41

- MACCOBY, HYAM: *1563m*, *2242zd*, *2357m*  
 MACDONALD, JOHN: 723f, 2139f, 2139k  
 MACDONALD, WILLIAM L.: 2979b, 2986d  
 MACKAY, CAMERON: 3171  
 MACKOWSKI, RICHARD M.: *3001s*  
 MACRAE, GEORGE W.: 1993  
 MADDEN, FREDERIC W.: 3179  
 MADER, ANDREAS EVARISTUS: 1289, 1291, 3168  
 MAFFUCCI, P.: 22421  
 MAGEN, YITZHAK: *1857q*  
 MAGIE, DAVID L.: 1201, 1399  
 MAIER, GERHARD: 1815, 2209, 2213, 2315, 2356  
 MAIER, JOHANN: 255e, 1857a, 2203, 2312, 2346, 2543, 2543n, 2543ze, 2686, 2818i  
 MAIER, PAUL L.: 1388, 1389, 1389f, 1394, 2093  
 MAISLER, BENJAMIN: see MAZAR  
 MAJOR, OTTO: 3487  
 MALAMAT, ABRAHAM: 814  
 MALEINA, A. J.: 174  
 MALEJ, W.: 172, 3546  
 MALINA, BRUCE J.: 715  
 MALINOWSKI, FRANCIS X.: 2687, 2695, *2695a*  
 MALKIEL, YAKOV: 3407, 3408, 3410, 3411, 3417  
 MALLEY, WILLIAM J.: 1657  
 MALTER, HENRY: 314  
 MALTMAN, SISTER NICHOLAS: 3367  
 MANDEL, SIEGFRIED: 3185  
 MANITIUS, MAX: 3544  
 MANN, JACOB: 315  
 MANNS, FRÉDERIC: 44a, 3173w  
 MANSON, THOMAS W.: 2756, 2804  
 MANSOOR, MENAHEM: 2352, 2357, 2373, 2531  
 MANTEL, HUGO (HAIM DOV): 1276, 1944, 1948g, 2153, 2208, 2242s, 2242u, 2246a, 2292, 2324, 2325, 2326b, 2326i, 2326j  
 MANTHEY, JULIUS R.: 3287, 3289  
 MARAZZI, MARIO: *438e*  
 MARCUS, JACOB: 14  
 MARCUS, RALPH: 32, 65, 66, 67, 72, 116, 117, 118, 207, 502, 547, 548, 636, 785, 823, 880, 934, 951, 964, 969, 1071, 1114, 1118, 1192, 1882, 2141, 2176, 2284, 2451, 2464, 2482, 2924, 3196, 3269, 3288, 3290  
 MARE, W. H.: 3219h  
 MARGAIN, JEAN: 2125b  
 MARGOT, JEAN-CLAUDE: 2217  
 MARIANI, BONAVENTURA: 1041  
 MARIE ALINE DE SION, SOEUR: 3016  
 MARIE ITA OF SION: 3019  
 MAROUZEAU, JULES: 16  
 MARSH, HENRY G.: 1169sc, 2720b, 3219f  
 MARTIN, CH.: 2731, 2792  
 MARTIN, C. H. R.: 940b  
 MARTIN, LUTHER H.: *1818eb*  
 MARTINI, CARLO M.: 2757  
 MARX, ALEXANDER: 12b  
 MARX, ALFRED: 2400, 2429k  
 MARX, MOSES: 289  
 MASADA, UNI: 3502  
 MASER, MALWINE: 34a  
 MASSARO, V.: 1469e  
 MASTIN, B. A.: 940c, 1904g  
 MATEU Y LLOPIS, FELIPE: 718  
 MATHEWS, SHAILER: 518  
 MATTHIAE, K.: 933o  
 MATTILL, ANDREW J.: 43  
 MATTILL, MARY B.: 43  
 MAURER, CHRISTIAN: 3018  
 MAYER, GÜNTHER: 38b, 530, 683, 720  
 MAYER, LEO A.: 2123, 3177  
 MAYER, REINHOLD: 397, 424, 1976  
 MAZAR (MAISLER), BENJAMIN: 974, 975, 976, 1297c, 1512e, 1869a, 1869b, *1869e*, 2976, 3001, 3001f, 3001g, 3031b, 3031c, 3031d, 3173e  
 MAZZARINO, SANTO: 581b  
 MCCOWN, CHESTER C.: 977, 1351, 1599i, 2708  
 MCCULLOUGH, W. STEWART: 919g  
 McDOWELL, EDWARD A.: 107  
 McELENY, NEIL J.: *2210w*  
 McKELVEY, R. J.: 1771e, 1857b, 3031a, 3266d  
 McKENZIE, JOHN L.: 1163  
 McKINNON, DONALD: 2847  
 McKNIGHT, EDGAR V.: 1161, 2769  
 McNAMARA, MARTIN: 639, 1753, 2476c  
 McNEILE, ALAN H.: 2879a  
 MEEKS, WAYNE A.: 704, 1492c, 1763, 1995, 2168  
 MEHLMANN, JOÃO: 1153  
 MEINERTZ, MAX: 2740a, 2865b  
 MEISNER, NORBERT: 949d  
 MELAMED, EZRA: 997, 999  
 MELLERSH, H. E. L.: 1528g  
 MÉNARD, JACQUES C.: 1739  
 MENDELS, DORON: *2392f*  
 MENDELSSOHN, LUDOVICUS: 1044  
 MERENTITES, KONSTANTIN I.: 1707a  
 MERINO, LUIZ DÍEZ: see Díez  
 MERKELBACH, REINHOLD: *102b*, 3333a

- MERTENS, ALFRED: 1169m, 1579, 1579a  
 MEŠČERSKIJ, NIKITA A.: 210, 215, 227, 229, 252, 290a  
 MESHEL, ZE'EV: 3063  
 MESHORER, YA'AKOV: 1107f, 1495, 3183  
 MESTSCHANSKI, JOSEPH: see MEYSHAN  
 METFORD, JOHN C. J.: 3424  
 METZGER, BRUCE M.: 42, 44, 766, 1158, 2763  
 MEYER, EDUARD: 724, 959, 1051i  
 MEYER, FRANZ E.: 1948d  
 MEYER, MICHAEL A.: 124  
 MEYER, RUDOLF: 435, 527, 661, 1107b, 1804, 1809, 1891, 1960, 1975, 2089, 2238, 2250  
 MEYERS, CAROL L.: 1857l, 3173q  
 MEYERS, ERIC M.: 1599f, 2957k, 3173m, 3173q  
 MEYSHAN (MESTSCHANSKI), JOSEPH (JOSEF): 1268, 1314, 1443, 3182, 3184  
 MEYSING, JACQUES: 673  
 MEZ, ADAM: 757  
 MICHAELSON, SIDNEY: 1635, 3251, 3281, 3282  
 MICHEL, A.: 2236  
 MICHEL, OTTO: 86, 138, 453, 806, 1543, 1818c, 1972, 1977, 1984f, 1984r, 2004a, 2028, 2242n, 2439, 2705, 3115, 3248, 3255, 3296, 3514  
 MICHELFELT, JOSEF: 1410  
 MIDDENDORP, THEOPHIL: 968a, 3219i  
 MIÉVIS, IDA: 92  
 MIGLIARIO, E.: 1646c  
 MILANO, ATTILIO: 560  
 MILBURN, ROBERT L. P.: 572  
 MILGROM, JACOB: 2543zf  
 MILLAR, FERGUS: 30, 201, 456, 915, 933m, 1051d, 1418, 1457, 1499, 1523, 1537, 1586, 1637, 1651, 1660, 1668, 2357l, 2392e, 2400a, 2690j, 2724, 2768, 2840  
 MILLER, CHARLES H.: 1255  
 MILLER, J. MAXWELL: 3173p  
 MILLER, JUDEA B.: 3150g  
 MILLER, LEO: 3392  
 MINC, RACHEL: 3077  
 MIREAUX, ÉMILE: 3400  
 MIRSKY, AARON: 613  
 MIRSKY, NORMAN B.: 3511d  
 MISCH, GEORG: 1645  
 MITTWOCH, A.: 966  
 MODELSKI, THEOPHIL E.: 308  
 MOEHRING, HORST R.: 376a, 425, 1206, 1223, 1648, 1997, 2177, 2364, 2872, 3277, 3278, 3388  
 MÖLLEKEN, WOLFGANG: 1889  
 MÖLLER, CHRISTA: 397, 424, 2957c  
 MOHRMANN, CHRISTINE: 3210  
 MOLIN, GEORG: 2389, 2484, 2485  
 MOMIGLIANO, ARNALDO D.: 565p, 824j, 933h, 940e, 991c, 1084ia, 1214, 1453, 1607, 1647j, 1710, 3206a  
 MOMMSEN, THEODOR: 1400, 1451, 1866e  
 MONTEFIORE, HUGH W.: 1591, 2894  
 MONTET, PIERRE: 733, 744b  
 MONTGOMERY, I.: 1469e  
 MONTGOMERY, JAMES A.: 758, 830, 1780, 2126, 2140  
 MOORE, CAREY A.: 340, 868  
 MOORE, ERNEST: 3219g  
 MOORE, GEORGE F.: 762, 1811, 2045, 2214  
 MOR, MENAHEM: 34b, 1904h, 2125d  
 MORALDI, LUIGI: 2543l  
 MOREAU, JACQUES: 262, 1663, 2798, 2806, 2820  
 MOREL, WILLY: 3116  
 MORENZ, SIEGFRIED: 661a  
 MORGENSTERN, JULIAN: 800, 1437, 1438, 1439, 1881  
 MORIN, J.-ALFRED: 2583e, 2640o  
 MØRKHOLM, OTTO: 1042  
 MORRISON, FRANK (= ROSS, ALBERT H.): 2961  
 MORTLEY, RAOUL: 581g, 744g, 1703d  
 MORTON, ANDREW Q.: 1635, 3251, 3281, 3282  
 MORVYIN, PETER: see MORVYNE  
 MORVYNE (MORWYNG, MORVYIN, MORWYN), PETER: 288  
 MORWYN, PETER: see MORVYNE  
 MORWYNG, PETER: see MORVYNE  
 MOSBECH, HOLGER: 496, 515  
 MOSCOVITZ, LARRY: 744n  
 MOSLEY, A. W.: 577  
 MOTZO, BACCHISIO: 387, 1505  
 MOUFLARD, MARIE-MADELEINE: 3398  
 MOULTON, WARREN J.: 2127  
 MOWINCKEL, SIGMUND O. P.: 836, 856, 2015, 2154b  
 MOWRY, LUCETTA: 1340, 2988  
 MRAS, KARL: 184, 3343  
 MUEHSAM, ALICE: 1837  
 MUELLER, H.: 2009c  
 MÜLLER, HELMUT: 1206e  
 MÜLLER, JACOBUS JOHANNES: 3499  
 MÜLLER, WERNER: 1605a, 3001a, 3374e  
 MULDER, H.: 1528f  
 MULIĆ, M. I.: 3444  
 MUNDO, ANSCARI: 3365  
 MÚNERA, JOSÉ: 2753

- MUNK, KAJ H. L.: 3491  
 MUNK, SALOMON: 313  
 MURMELSTEIN, BENJAMIN: 141  
 MURPHY-O'CONNOR, JEROME: 1101d, 1904i,  
 2418e, 2429m, 2456a  
 MURRAY, OSWYN: 1682, 1695  
 MUSURILLO, HERBERT A.: 1475  
 VON MUTIUS, HANS-GEORGE: 3386a  
 MYERS, JACOB M.: 837
- NABER, SAMUEL A.: 71  
 NADEL, BENIAMIN: 1778, 3245  
 NADER, HELEN: 3426  
 NAGEL, GEORGES: 1027  
 NAHMAD, H. M.: 360  
 NAHON, GÉRARD: 536  
 NARKISS, BEZALEL: 1857f, 3437, 3438  
 NARKISS, MORDECHAI: 1533, 1535  
 NAUTIN, PIERRE: 1654, 1655, 1656  
 NAVEH, JOSEPH: 1126, 3187  
 NAVILLE, EDOUARD H.: 1914  
 NAZZARO, ANTONIO V.: 1771f, 2395b  
 NEDAVA, JOSEPH: 2605  
 NE'EMAN, NAFTALI: 3483a  
 NEGEV, AVRAHAM: 1358d, 2170h, 2968b,  
 2968h, 3036a, 3112e, 3158c, 3158f, 3160a  
 NEOĞIŢ(S)A, ATHANASE: 2448, 2449, 2455,  
 2456  
 NEHER-BERNHEIM, RENÉE: 1169e  
 NEIRYNCK, F.: 3286a  
 NESTLE, ERWIN: 489  
 NETZER, EHUD: 1297d, 2968l, 2985, 2988a,  
 2988b, 2988e, 3014l  
 NEUBAUER, ADOLF: 310  
 NEUMAN, ABRAHAM A.: 301, 337, 346, 349  
 NEUMARK, HERMANN: see AMIR, JEHOŠHUA  
 NEUSNER, JACOB: 434, 1169r, 1284a, 1286,  
 1352c, 1355, 1356, 1547o 1570, 1957a,  
 2242k, 2242w, 2242x, 2242zc, 2242zg,  
 2242zh, 2244, 2245, 2245a, 2245b, 2245c,  
 2274, 2286b, 2286ba, 2299c, 2311,  
 2915, 2916, 3319b, 3362  
 NEWMAN, LOUIS I.: 3498  
 NEWSOM, CARROLL V.: 1169sg, 2774f  
 New York Public Library: 4  
 NICKELSBURG, GEORGE W. E.: 2404, 3350  
 NICKLIN, T.: 2825a  
 NICOLAS, MICHEL: 2210a  
 NICOLS, JOHN: 1620b  
 NIDITCH, SUSAN: 983e  
 NIESE, BENEDICT (BENEDICTUS): 69, 70, 457,  
 586, 1664, 3197
- NIKIPROWETZKY, VALENTIN: 565h, 1801,  
 1803l, 2022, 2614a, 2631c, 2683, 2684,  
 2685, 3110  
 NIKOLAINEN, AIMO T.: 1808a  
 NOACK, BENT: 2395, 2818o  
 NOBER, PETER: 21a  
 NOCK, ARTHUR D.: 2932  
 NODELMAN, SHELDON A.: 1510, 3190  
 NÖLDEKE, THEODOR: 206e  
 NOERDLINGER, HENRY S.: 3509  
 NÖTSCHER, FRIEDRICH: 2216b  
 NOJA, SERGIO: 2125a  
 DE NOLHAC, PIERRE: 3404  
 NOLLAND, JOHN: 2418g  
 NORDEN, EDUARD: 947, 1729, 1790, 2796  
 NORDSTRÖM, CARL-OTTO: 3438d, 3438e,  
 3547a  
 NORTH, ROBERT G.: 2065, 2068a, 2429c,  
 3161, 3219c  
 NOTH, MARTIN: 873, 2197, 2497
- OELLACHER, HANS: 88  
 OEPKE, ALBRECHT: 2009b  
 OESTERLEY, WILLIAM O. E.: 869, 2205  
 OGG, GEORGE: 1429b, 2869, 2891g  
 OLITZKY, MARCUS: 2034  
 OLMSTEAD, ALBERT T. E.: 1375, 3292  
 O'NEILL, J. C.: 2022c  
 VAN OOTEGHEM, JULES: 1175  
 OPPENHEIMER, AHARON: 2055e  
 ORLAN, HAYYIM: 3138, 3139, 3143, 3145  
 ORTH, WOLFGANG: 1366c  
 ORY, GEORGES: 2357g, 2361a, 2711, 2774t,  
 2825r  
 OSIANDER, LUCAS: 2781  
 OSIEK, CAROLYN: 747, 1773, 2137  
 OTT, H.: 3291b  
 OTT, JOHANN B.: 3194  
 OTTO, WALTER: 1212, 1279, 1299, 1332
- PALTIEL, ELIEZER: 1169a  
 PANI, MARIO: 1327  
 PARENTE, FAUSTO: 2640d, 2816, 2891r  
 PARET, HEINRICH: 2228  
 PARKER, HAROLD M.: 919p  
 PARKER, ROSCOE E.: 3394  
 PARKER, S. THOMAS: 3176c  
 PARKES, JAMES W.: 417, 1033, 2181, 2316  
 PARROT, ANDRÉ: 1834, 2133, 2159  
 PARVIS, MERRILL M.: 41  
 PASCAL, PIERRE: 209, 237  
 PASCHEN, WILFRIED: 2438a, 3219s  
 PATAI, RAPHAEL: 565n, 3266a

- PATON, LEWIS B.: 860  
 PATZ, NORMAN: 290c  
 PAUL, ANDRÉ: 38c, 565r, 824c  
 PAWEL, ERNEST: 376  
 PAX, ELPIDIUS: 1795, 1818b  
 PEARLMAN, MOSHE: 1051c, 3001e, 3066  
 PEARSE, NANCY C.: 3397a  
 PEASE, SAMUEL J.: 1601  
 PEDDINGHAUS, C. D.: 1389b, 1818f, 1948b, 2022b  
 PEDERSEN, SIEGFRIED: 601f  
 PEDROSO, VINCENTE: 173  
 PELLETIER, ANDRÉ: 87f, 132, 133, 565k, 717, 945, 946, 1444a, 1469b, 1488g, 1506, 1620f, 1639, 1771g, 1848, 1849, 2064c, 2074f, 2074g, 2759, 2760, 3219zg, 3244, 3307, 3353d  
 PENNA, ANGELO: 989, 2550  
 PEÑUELA, JOAQUIN M.: 793  
 PÉPIN, JEAN: 3264  
 PERLES, FELIX: 565e, 996  
 PERLMUTER, MOSHE: 2540  
 PEROWNE, STEWART: 1221, 1325  
 PERROT, CHARLES: 706  
 PETER, M.: 690  
 PETERS, FRANCIS E.: 910  
 PETERSEN, HANS: 1649, 3279  
 PETIT, FRANÇOISE: 91a  
 PETIT, MADELEINE: 723b, 744m  
 PETTIRSCH, FRANZ: 2056  
 PFEIFER, GERHARD: 2048e  
 PFEIFFER, CHARLES F.: 472, 483, 881, 897  
 PFEIFFER, ROBERT H.: 670, 1146, 1647g, 2919  
 PFISTER, FRIEDRICH: 940a, 3370a, 3374d  
 PFITZNER, VICTOR C.: 1771d, 3252a  
 PFLAUM, HANS G.: 1368  
 PHARR, CLYDE: 2800b  
 PHILIPPIDIS, LEONIDAS J.: 1169d  
 PHILONENKO, MARC: 256, 2357j  
 PHRINLINGOS, KOSTAS I.: 75  
 PIANKO, GABRIELA: 18, 19  
 PIATTELLI, DANIELA: 1169k  
 PICARD, (GILBERT) CHARLES: 1516, 3159  
 PICCIRILLO, M.: 3036f  
 PIN, BENJAMIN: 1142  
 PINES, SHLOMO: 79, 87c, 2286c, 2326c, 2814  
 PIPEROV, BOIAN: 591  
 PIRENNE, JACQUELINE: 1512a  
 PIRON, MORDECAI: 2184, 2525  
 PIXNER, BARGIL: 3031k, 3031m  
 VAN DER PLOEG, JOHANNES P. M.: 2399, 2403, 2408, 2431, 2432, 2552  
 PLÖGER, OTTO: 1055, 2952  
 PLÜMACHER, ECKHARD: 1671e  
 PÖSCHL, VIKTOR: 3266  
 PÖTSCHER, WALTER: 2724e, 2774v  
 POHLENZ, MAX: 1488t  
 POHLMANN, KARL-FRIEDRICH: 839  
 POLIAK, ABRAHAM N.: 2631, 3386  
 POLIAKOV, LÉON: 1084f  
 POLISH, DAVID: 1561  
 POLLARD, ALFRED W.: 90  
 POLLOCK, ALGERNON J.: 590  
 PONN, ALAN: 477, 1784, 2572  
 POOLE, GARY W.: 539  
 POPKES, WIARD: 3219w  
 PORTE, ILANA D'ANCONA: 1293  
 POTTER, CHARLES F.: 2562a  
 DE LA POTTERIE, IGNACE: 1909b  
 POUILLY, JEAN: 2543zi, 2543zj  
 PRAUSE, GERHARD: 1265h  
 PRÉAUX, CLAIRE: 983a, 1070c  
 PRÉCHAC, LOUIS: 2770, 2794  
 PREISKER, HERBERT: 2171  
 PRELLER, HUGO H.: 565d  
 PRESS, ISAIAH: 2937  
 PRIEBATSCH, HANS: 696  
 PRIERO, GIUSEPPE: 503  
 PRIGENT, PIERRE: 1524, 2579, 2818l, 2997  
 PRYKE, E. J.: 2541  
 PUCCI, MARINA: 354f, 1169si  
 PURVIS, JAMES D.: 2152  
 QUISPTEL, GILLES: 3354  
 RABAN, AVNER: 2968m  
 RABELLO, ALFRED MORDEC(H)AI: 1302c, 1865, 1866, 1866c, 1866d, 2107g  
 RABIN, CHAIM: 1119, 1635d, 2309, 3212d  
 RABINOWITZ, ISAAC: 1063b, 2170i  
 RABINOWITZ, LOUIS I. (LEVI YITZHAK): 3129, 3130, 3131  
 RABINOWITZ, YITZHAK I.: see HALEVY  
 RABINOWITZ, ZE'EV W.: 1857j  
 RADERMACHER, LUDWIG: 381  
 RADOVICH, NATALINO: 156a  
 RADOZYCKI, JAN: 172, 2818la  
 RAHLFS, ALFRED: 764  
 RAINEY, ANSON F.: 3173o  
 RAISIN, JACOB S.: 2811c  
 RAJAK, TESSA: 87g, 393, 439, 486, 564, 601c, 723c, 723h, 842a, 868d, 1063c, 1107g, 1457, 1507, 1646b, 1647h, 1668, 1707b, 2690d, 3291d, 3530

- RAMSAY, WILLIAM M.: 2845  
 VON RANKE, LEOPOLD: 698  
 RANKIN, OLIVER SHAW: 723d, 2078  
 RANOWITSCH, ABRAM B.: 1003  
 RAPAPORT, URIEL: see RAPPAPORT  
 RAPHAEL, CHAIM: 1574  
 RAPHAEL, MARC L.: 3457b  
 RAPPAPORT, S.: 565m  
 RAPPAPORT, SALOMO: 474, 589, 635, 700, 1749, 3321  
 RAPPAPORT (RAPAPORT), URIEL: 33, 34b, 68a, 154a, 371e, 896, 919b, 919d, 1092b, 1092mb, 1127, 1267, 1373d, 11547f, 1547h, 1694, 2705h, 2906, 2957h, 3176a, 3192c  
 RAVENNA, ALFREDO: 343  
 RAVID, WITA: 13a  
 REALBERG, LEO: 1599d  
 REBUFFAT, RENÉ: 820h  
 REDFORD, DONALD B.: 743  
 REDGRAVE, GILBERT R.: 90  
 REES, W.: 1329  
 REESE, G.: 919e  
 REHKOPF, FRIEDRICH: 76b  
 REICHEL, O. ASHER: 2242c  
 REICKE, BO: 894, 1229, 1240, 2567, 2693  
 REIFENBERG, ADOLF: 1435, 2963, 3180, 3189  
 REILING, J.: 1978, 1979  
 REINACH, SALOMON: 240  
 REINACH, THÉODORE: 131, 1169vb, 1479, 1677, 2761  
 REINER, JACOB: 275, 284, 287a, 287b, 295a, 354c, 3446, 3448  
 REININK, G. J.: 676e  
 RENAN, ERNEST: 1176a  
 RENASSIA, YOCEF B. D.: 162  
 RENGSTORF, KARL H.: 1056a, 1900, 1991, 1992, 2454, 2510, 2585, 2841, 2891f, 3193, 3219za  
 RENOV, I.: 1855  
 REUMANN, J.: 1803h, 3219v  
 REUSS, FRIEDRICH: 61  
 RÉVAY, JÓZSEF: 167, 168, 169  
 REVEL, BERNARD: 2038  
 REWOLINSKI, ED.: 747, 1773, 2137  
 REY-COQUAIS, JEAN-PAUL: 3173  
 REYERO, S.: 1370  
 REZNIKOFF, CHARLES: 492  
 RHOADS, DAVID M.: 1547e, 1731a, 2581, 2690b  
 RICCIOTTI, GIUSEPPE (JOSÉ): 155, 158, 499, 540, 566, 637, 844, 850, 879, 1200, 1218, 1917, 2129, 2575, 2738  
 RICHARDS, GEORGE C.: 94, 203, 2809, 3274  
 RICHMOND, IAN A.: 3046  
 RIEDINGER, R.: 3353a  
 RIEDINGER, UTTO: 3353  
 RIESENFELD, HARALD: 1444  
 RIGG, HORACE A., JR.: 93  
 RINALDI, GIOVANNI: 3207  
 RINGEL, JOSEPH: 2968g  
 RINGGREN, HELMER: 2187, 2528  
 RISKIN, STEVEN: 2041, 2051, 2055, 2100, 2105, 2115, 2122  
 RITTER, HANS W.: 1468  
 RIVKIN, ELLIS: 1948i, 2022d, 2242d, 2242f, 2242u, 2252, 2254, 2255, 2256, 2257, 2258, 2259, 2265, 2265a, 2326h  
 ROBERT, ANDRÉ: 769  
 ROBERT, LOUIS: 2926  
 ROBERTS, BLEDDYN J.: 2498  
 ROBERTS, COLIN H.: 763  
 ROBINSON, GORDON: 901  
 RÖSSLER, DIETRICH: 3319a  
 ROGERS, ROBERT S.: 1361  
 ROGOVIN, HYMAN: 865  
 ROKEAH, DAVID: 1984s, 2100b  
 ROLL, I. (YISROEL): 1563i, 2957d  
 ROLLINS, WAYNE G.: 2309a  
 ROMANO, GIORGIO: 24a  
 ROOS, ANTOON G.: 2852  
 ROSEN, HAIIM B.: 3204  
 ROSENBERG, ROY A.: 2406e, 2429p, 2543v  
 ROSENBLOOM, JOSEPH R.: 2911k, 2918b  
 ROSENTHAL, ERWIN I. J.: 3388c, 3393a, 3457a  
 ROSENTHAL, JUDAH: 411, 1598, 3137, 3494  
 ROSMARIN, TRUDE: see WEISS-ROSMARIN  
 ROSS, ALBERT H.: see MORRISON, FRANK  
 ROSS, WILLIAM: 3004  
 DEI ROSSI, AZARIAH: 642  
 ROST, LEONHARD: 1231  
 ROSTON, MURRAY: 3391  
 ROSTOVITZ, MICHAEL: 973  
 ROTH, CECIL: 497, 507, 562, 603, 1541, 1542, 1555, 1556, 1557, 1614, 2090, 2297, 2503, 2504, 2505, 2513, 2571, 2587, 2594, 2615, 2622, 2623, 2624, 2625, 2629, 2649, 2651, 2653, 2655, 2656, 2657, 2658, 2705b, 3055, 3056  
 ROTH, NORMAN: 3388e  
 ROTH, WOLFGANG: 1092i, 1196b, 2957g  
 ROTH-GARSON, LEA: 371g, 1492d, 1547p, 1563n, 1619a, 1866j  
 ROTHENBERG, BENO: 3050  
 ROTHSTEIN, RAPHAEL: 3083d, 3511b

- ROWLEY, HAROLD H.: 845, 846, 857, 1098,  
 1101a, 1880, 1886, 2144, 2157, 2308, 2487,  
 2488, 2543g, 2627, 2628, 2705c  
 ROWTON, M. B.: 789  
 RUBENSTEIN, LAURENCE H.: 290b  
 RUBINSTEIN, ARIE: 254, 257, 258  
 RUCKSTUHL, EUGEN: 2416  
 RUDOLPH, WILHELM: 611, 834, 848  
 RUNNALLS, DONNA R.: 1802, 3257  
 RUSCHE, HELGA: 689  
 RUSSELL, DAVID S.: 898, 2193, 2538, 2561  
 RYDBECK, LARS: 3291a  
 RYLE, HERBERT E.: 644  
  
 SACCHI, PAOLO: 919i, 1789c, 1814, 2201,  
 2212, 2334  
 SADDINGTON, D. B.: 1605, 3330  
 SÁENZ, ANTONIO PIÑERO: 102a  
 SAFAR, FUAD: 820e  
 SAFRAI, SHMUEL (SAMUEL): 917, 918, 1789d,  
 1825e, 1840, 1951a, 2069, 2070, 2071,  
 2074d, 2202, 3218a  
 SAFRAI, ZEEV: 1563q, 2942a, 2957n  
 SAKLATVALA, BERAM: 1169sc  
 SALLARINI, ANTHONY J.: 438b  
 SALOMONSEN, BØRGE: 1281, 2188, 2570, 2597  
 SALVADOR, J.: 2774ze  
 SAMARANCH, FRANCISCO DE P.: 160  
 SAND, ALEXANDER: 1808  
 SANDA, VOJTĚCH: 2744  
 SANDERS, JAMES A.: 55, 56, 59c, 2543o  
 SANDERS, M.: 360  
 SANDISON, A. T.: 1315  
 SANDMEL, SAMUEL: 565s, 581b, 626c, 678,  
 679, 680, 933l, 933y, 1149, 1236, 1247,  
 1386, 1488p, 1647e, 1760, 1771i, 1791,  
 2198, 2210l, 2355  
 SANFORD, EVA M.: 1513, 3317, 3542  
 SANTI AMANTINI, LUIGI: 1070e  
 SATRAN, DAVID: 824k  
 SAUMAGNE, CHARLES: 1428, 3329  
 SAVINEL, P.: 133a  
 SCARPAT, GIUSEPPE: 1169sd, 2932d  
 SCARPELLINI, ANGELO: 156  
 SCHÄFER, PETER: 438d, 723, 933n, 1789f,  
 2242y, 3384c  
 SCHAFLER, SAMUEL: 354d, 1092d  
 SCHALIT, ABRAHAM: 74, 77, 87, 140, 148,  
 396, 401, 428, 429, 443, 444, 487, 537,  
 538, 575, 580, 610, 626ea, 629, 630, 631,  
 751, 819, 825, 827, 853, 888, 908, 932, 950,  
 968, 1079, 1080, 1110, 1111, 1134, 1138,  
 1139, 1170, 1195, 1207, 1230, 1256, 1264,  
 1265k, 1304, 1305, 1308, 1311, 1326, 1357,  
 1594c, 1643, 1823, 2010, 2029, 2047,  
 2048o, 2113, 2170d, 2182, 2347, 2526,  
 2870, 2946, 2947, 3047, 3048, 3199, 3220,  
 3250, 3297, 3299, 3302, 3305, 3515, 3522  
 SCHALLER, BERNDT: 531, 1328, 1688, 3166  
 SCHALLER, J. B.: 676a  
 SCHAUMBERGER, JOANNES (JOHANNES): 1050,  
 2066  
 SCHECHTER, SOLOMON: 2303  
 SCHECKER, HEINZ: 587, 604  
 SCHEDL, CLAUS: 893  
 SCHEIBER, ALEXANDER (SÁNDOR): 1571, 3508  
 SCHEIDWEILER, FELIX: 246, 2741, 2742, 2788,  
 2801  
 SCHEIN, BRUCE E.: 3014ia  
 SCHELLE, B.: 3367b  
 SCHELLER, MEINRAD: 3219  
 SCHEMANN, FRIEDRICH: 1466  
 SCHIFFMAN, LAWRENCE H.: 2048h, 2064d,  
 2543p, 2918c  
 SCHILDENBERGER, JOHANNES: 339, 861  
 (VON) SCHLATTER, ADOLF: 448, 460, 1781,  
 2094, 2828, 2891a, 3221  
 SCHMALZRIEDT, EGIDIUS: 531a  
 SCHMELZER, MENAHEM H.: 12b  
 SCHMIDT, FRANCIS: 565j  
 SCHMIDT, GUILDMUS: 3252d, 3285  
 SCHMIDT, KARL L.: 245, 2005, 2733  
 SCHMITT, GÖTZ: 1563l, 2957c, 2979a, 3173c  
 SCHMITT, J.: 2334b, 2392a  
 SCHMITTLEIN, RAYMOND: 2774c  
 SCHMITZ, OTTO: 677  
 SCHNEIDER, ALFONS M.: 1867  
 SCHNEIDER, CARL: 933e  
 SCHNEIDER, HEINRICH: 851  
 SCHOEDEL, WILLIAM R.: 1647i  
 SCHÖNFELD, HANS-G.: 2468  
 SCHOEPS, HANS-J.: 691a, 1131, 1984a, 1984b,  
 1984q, 2406a, 2825b  
 SCHOFIELD, GUY: 1333, 2714, 3346  
 SCHOLEM, GERSHOM G.: 2465  
 SCHOLZ, OTTO: 180  
 SCHONFIELD, HUGH J.: 255a, 581e, 2499,  
 2640s, 2891m  
 SCHORR, ALEXANDER: 147  
 SCHOTTROFF, WILLY: 1112, 3036, 3157  
 SCHRAMM, PERCY E.: 319  
 SCHRECKENBERG, HEINZ: 1, 63, 68c, 73, 78,  
 80, 87b, 89, 100, 101, 102, 192a, 204, 796,  
 948, 1640, 2783, 2790a, 2818b, 2891s,  
 3252b, 3283, 3298, 3311, 3312, 3319, 3326,  
 3340, 3438g, 3525, 3536a

- SCHREIDEN, JACQUES: 2520  
 SCHRENK, GOTTLÖB: 2221  
 SCHUBERT, KURT: 807, 1164, 2012b, 2093d,  
 2199, 2200, 2210h, 2302, 2411, 2489, 2506,  
 2543n  
 SCHÜLLER, S.: 986  
 SCHÜRER, EMIL: 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 201, 400,  
 454, 455, 456, 569, 915, 992, 1177, 1197,  
 1418, 1499, 1523, 1537, 1583, 1586, 1637,  
 1651, 1660, 1686, 1736, 1789g, 2174, 2294,  
 2357l, 2381, 2392e, 2400a, 2543zk, 2690j,  
 2702, 2724, 2840  
 SCHÜTZ, ROLAND: 2717  
 SCHUHL, PIERRE-MAXIME: 1674  
 SCHUNCK, KLAUS D.: 988, 1008, 1009p  
 SCHUR, WERNER: 1344, 3323  
 SCHWAB, MOISE: 286  
 SCHWABE, MOSHE: 997, 1860, 3173f, 3216  
 SCHWARK, JÜRGEN: 2829  
 SCHWARTZ, DANIEL R.: 828e, 1398c, 1827c  
 SCHWARTZ, EDUARD: 809  
 SCHWARTZ, JACQUES: 736, 1422, 1442  
 SCHWARZBACH, BERTRAM E.: 3402  
 SCHWARZBAUM, HAIM: 694, 1128, 3536  
 SCOBIE, CHARLES H. H.: 2720h  
 SCRAMUZZA, VINCENT M.: 1465, 1482  
 SEELIGMANN, ISAC L.: 753, 1926  
 SEGAL, A.: 2986  
 SEGAL, I.: 3503  
 SEGAL, MOSES H.: 648, 858, 1130, 2143,  
 2156  
 SEGERT, STANISLAV: 2543b  
 Segré, ANGELO: 1483  
 SEIDENSTICKER, PHILIP: 2180, 2774i  
 SELDEN, JOHN: 2033  
 SELKE, ANGELA: 3427  
 VAN SELMS, A.: 3031l  
 SEMPER, ALFRED: 919s  
 SEN, F.: 371  
 SENDREY, ALFRED: 3266e  
 SÉROUYA, HENRI: 2391, 2553  
 VAN SETERS, JOHN: 742  
 SEVENSTER, JAN N.: 3117, 3231  
 SEYBERLICH, ROSE-MARIE: 866, 3301  
 SEYRIG, HENRI: 1060, 1502, 1503, 1534, 1536,  
 3192  
 SHACHAR, ARIE: 3001n, 3001o  
 SHALOM, SHIN: 3507  
 SHAMIR, MOSHE: 3506  
 SHANKS, HERSHEL: 3173n  
 SHARGEL, BAILA R.: 3083g, 3112h, 3511f  
 SHARVIT, BARUCH: 1827b, 2543w, 2543x,  
 2543za, 2543zc  
 SHATZMAN, I.: 919b  
 SHENKEL, JAMES D.: 775  
 SHERK, ROBERT K.: 1206d, 2843  
 SHERWIN-WHITE, ADRIAN N.: 2846  
 SHINAN, AVIGDOR: 723k  
 SHINMI, HIROSHI: 170b  
 SHOCHAT, AZRIEL: 432, 877, 1963, 2012  
 SHOTWELL, JAMES T.: 541, 744a, 1703e  
 SHOTWELL, WILLIS A.: 3029  
 SHŪICHI, IWAMOTO: 170  
 SHUNAMI, SHLOMO: 2  
 SHUTT, ROBERT J. H.: 76, 94, 129, 203, 383,  
 478, 574, 632, 949b, 1232, 1713, 1718,  
 1724, 1803mf, 1818ea, 2216d, 2754, 3109,  
 3225, 3280, 3533  
 SIEDL, SUITBERT H.: 2529  
 SIEGEL, JONATHAN P.: 626f, 661d  
 SIEGERT, FOLKER: 2931  
 SIEGFRIED, CARL: 592, 1747  
 SIEGMUND, ALBERT: 3367a, 3374a  
 SIEVERS, JOSEPH: 1063d, 1092mc, 1102e,  
 1107i  
 SIJPESTEIJN, PIETER J.: 1169g, 1635g, 1745,  
 3207b  
 SILVA, M.: 2242ze  
 SILVER, DANIEL J.: 707, 1934  
 SIMCHONI (SIMCHOWITZ), JACOB N. H.: 146,  
 150, 408  
 SIMCHOWITZ, JACOB N. H.: see SIMCHONI  
 SIMON, JEAN: 364  
 SIMON, MARCEL: 38, 902, 938, 939, 1488e,  
 1803j, 2022h, 2183, 2447, 2542, 2613,  
 2678, 2911j, 3512  
 SIMONETTA, B.: 1352, 3191  
 SIMONS, JAN J.: 1831, 2940, 2990, 3005, 3006,  
 3030  
 SIMONSOHN, SHLOMO: 354e, 3119a  
 SINKO, TADEUSZ: 546  
 SINT, JOSEF A.: 1697, 2720i  
 SKIMINA, STANISLAW: 1661, 3238, 3537  
 SLAUGHTER, FRANK G.: 3479  
 SLOYAN, GERARD S.: 1389l  
 SMALLEY, BERYL: 3372  
 SMALLWOOD, EDITH MARY: 495, 909, 1159,  
 1169o, 1169x, 1189b, 1193, 1206i, 1275a,  
 1364, 1383, 1393, 1397, 1417, 1427, 1429,  
 1450, 1628c, 1744, 1896, 2871, 2873f,  
 3112f, 3328  
 SMITH, DAVID A.: 1161, 2769  
 SMITH, DWIGHT MOODY, JR.: 2771  
 SMITH, EDGAR W.: 697b  
 SMITH, MORTON: 842, 895, 920, 921, 936,  
 1038, 1803e, 1803u, 1878, 1930, 2022j,



- 2088, 2138, 2210, 2210g, 2243, 2334g,  
2362, 2363, 2434, 2445b, 2580, 2676,  
2720o, 2818c, 2825m, 2911h, 2929, 3348
- SMITH, WALTER F.: 1883, 1928, 2415
- SMITH, WILLIAM ROBERTSON: 645
- SMOLAR, LEIVY: 719
- SNAITH, NORMAN H.: 872, 1184
- SOBEL, RONALD B.: 617
- SOGGIN, J. ALBERTO: 828b
- SOHLBERG, DAVID: 1957
- SOLOMON, DAVID J.: 2012a
- SOLTAU, WILHELM: 2834
- SONKA, JAROSLAV: 163
- SORDI, MARTA: 1389a
- SORSCHER, ESTHER: 185, 279, 300, 323, 350
- SOURDEL, DOMINIQUE: 3176
- SOWERS, SIDNEY G.: 1812, 1903
- SPATZ, ERWIN: 3078
- SPEICHER, GÜNTER: 2720j, 2774l
- SPEIDEL, KURT A.: 1389i
- SPERBER, DANIEL: 1626, 3233
- SPERO, SHUBERT: 3094, 3146
- SPEYER, WOLFGANG: 676d, 1663c, 1663d,  
2774p
- SPICQ, CESLAUS: 3203, 3203d, 3373
- SPIRO, ABRAHAM: 745, 1772, 2130
- SPIRO, JACK D.: 580a, 581, 1999, 2003
- SPIVEY, ROBERT A.: 2771
- SPRÖDOWSKY, HANS: 695
- STÄHLIN, GUSTAV: 1818
- STAERK, WILLY: 465
- STAGG, EVELYN: 2032a
- STAGG, FRANK: 2032a
- STARCKY, JEAN: 1708, 2543zg, 2631e, 2720q,  
2979, 3156, 3158b, 3170
- STAUFFER, ETHELBERT: 431, 521, 1150, 1280,  
1376, 1412, 1843, 2189, 2780, 2863, 2889,  
3188, 3219u
- STEARNS, WALLACE N.: 3516
- STEBBING, H.: 105
- STECK, ODIL H.: 828a, 1984d, 2885b
- STECKOLL, SOLOMON H.: 2417
- STEGEMANN, HARTMUT: 2543e, 2903
- STEIN, ARTHUR: 1452, 1566, 3523
- STEIN, E.: 1419
- STEIN, ELCHANAN: 3237, 3273
- STEIN, JACOB: 3067
- STEIN, MENAHEM (EDMUND): 1526, 2394,  
3334
- STEIN, SALOMON: 2080
- STEINER, A.: 2427
- STEINMANN, JEAN: 2720c
- STEINMETZER, F. X.: 2860
- STEINSCHNEIDER, MORITZ: 276, 333, 356,  
357, 3363
- STEKELIS, MOSHE: 2938
- STELMA, JUURD H.: 2743
- STEMBERGER, GÜNTER: 565o, 1169se
- STENDAHL, KRISTER: 2420
- STENDER-PETERSEN, ADOLF A.: 1602, 3442
- STEPHAN [*sic*]: 3023
- STERN, ELIYAHU: 1539
- STERN, EPHRAIM: 2957j
- STERN, MENAHEM: 152, 438, 456a, 565, 565c,  
576, 903, 913, 917, 919c, 933f, 933z, 933za,  
982, 983b, 1009l, 1039, 1040, 1084i, 1085,  
1106, 1125, 1133, 1138f, 1166a, 1167,  
1169sj, 1169va, 1196a, 1206f, 1206k, 1244,  
1261, 1265, 1265d, 1372, 1429c, 1444c,  
1593, 1635c, 1676, 1678, 1681, 1703b,  
1714, 1716, 1716a, 1716b, 1716c, 1719,  
1719a, 1921, 2605a, 2675, 2690i, 2705d,  
2705g, 2927, 2942, 3096, 3134, 3247,  
3331b, 3338a, 3521
- STEURNAGEL, CARL: 2233, 2249
- STÈVE, M. A. (MARIE-JOSEPH): 1833, 2991,  
3017
- STEWART, R. A.: 1871
- STIEHL, RUTH: 1358a, 1511, 2917
- STILLWELL, RICHARD: 2957e
- STOLLMAN, SAMUEL S.: 3393b
- STONE, DONALD: 3399
- STONE, LAWRENCE: 1547i, 1559
- STONE, MICHAEL E.: 919n, 2210x, 2543zo,  
2690k
- STORY, CULLEN I. K.: 2014
- STRANGE, JAMES F.: 1599f, 2957k, 3173m,  
3173q
- STRATHMANN, HERMANN: 2006
- STRAUSS, HEINRICH: 1624, 1628
- STREETER, BURNETT H.: 2858
- STROBEL, AUGUST: 1904a, 2025, 2074, 2406c,  
2646, 2818p, 2825s, 2970, 2970a, 3014,  
3034, 3035, 3036d, 3106
- STRUGNELL, JOHN: 226, 271, 307, 532, 2412,  
2507
- STÜWER, WILHELM: 199
- STUHLMACHER, PETER: 3207c, 3219m
- STUMPF, ALBRECHT: 2584
- SUGITA, ROKUICHI: 1224, 1528d
- SUGRANYES DE FRANCH, RAMON: 2048c,  
2107d, 3192a, 3219e
- SUKENIK, ELIEZER (ELEAZAR) L.: 1093, 1290,  
2166
- SULLIVAN, RICHARD D.: 1169s, 1358g, 1488o,  
3176e

- SUNDBERG, ALBERT C.: 655, 3173a  
 SUOLAHTI, JAAKO: 1203, 1605d  
 SURBURG, RAYMOND F.: 565l  
 SUSEMIHL, FRANZ: 1684  
 SUTCLIFFE, EDMUND F.: 2331, 2436, 2511  
 SVOBODA, KAREL: 20  
 SWAIN, JOSEPH W.: 1646, 2778, 2875  
 SWAN, MICHAEL: 1463, 2101b  
 SYME, RONALD: 1373, 1454, 1461, 2853  
 SYRKIN, MARIE: 3511  
 SZÉKELY, EDMOND B.: 2333, 2333*a*, 2333*b*, 2543f  
 SZYSZMAN, S.: 211, 228  
  
 TACHAUER, GUSTAV: 584  
 TADMOR, HAYIM: 815  
 TAEGER, FRITZ: 1789b, 2357c  
 TÄUBLER, EUGEN (EUGENE): 960, 1045, 1349  
 TAIT, PETER G.: 3428  
 TAKAHASHI, MASASHI: 170a, 565*za*  
 TALBERT, CHARLES H.: 723i, 723l  
 TALMI, EPHRAIM: 153  
 TALMON, SHMARJAHU (SHEMARYAHU): 2357e, 2429, 2543m  
 TAMARI, ZVI: 933g  
 TAMARIN, ALFRED H.: 121, 3071  
 TAMM, BIRGITTA: 1449, 3332  
 TARN, WILLIAM W.: 1471, 2278  
 TARRÉS, MANUEL: 2734  
 TAVYOEMY (TAVYOMI), TOBIAH (TUBIAH) J.: 557, 2237, 2248, 2295  
 TAVYOMI, TOBIAH J.: see TAVYOEMY  
 TAYLOR, JAMES E.: 968d  
 TAYLOR, LILY R.: 2844  
 TAYLOR, R. O. P.: 2825a  
 TCHERIKOVER (TSCHERIKOWER), VICTOR A. (AVIGDOR): 553, 885, 887, 919*oa*, 927, 965, 980, 981, 1017, 1018, 1022*a*, 1023, 1048, 1051l, 1069, 1070, 1300, 1476, 1480, 1488, 1488q, 1646d, 1700, 1866*l*, 1894, 1920, 2024, 2063, 2207, 3271  
 TEDESCHE, SIDNEY: 998, 1011  
 TEICHER, JACOB L.: 2547  
 TEIXIDOR: JAVIER: 1512, 2100e  
 TEMPE, DIETER: 1009g  
 TENNEY, MERRILL C.: 878, 2191, 2868  
 THACKERAY, HENRY ST. JOHN: 72, 231, 394, 452, 459, 474b, 479, 488a, 636, 654, 671, 744k, 754, 755, 785, 797, 1501, 1519, 1544, 1581, 1642, 1651c, 1721, 1748, 1777, 1822, 1932, 1988, 2076, 2705e*a*, 2707, 2775, 2791, 2797, 2803, 2819, 2930, 3112, 3126, 3196, 3246, 3260, 3268, 3269, 3527, 3536*d*  
 THEILER, WILLY: 1818a  
 THÉRON, BERNARD: 581*i*, 2004*b*, 3259*h*  
 THIELE, EDWIN R.: 794, 804  
 THIEME, KARL: 3475a  
 THIERING, BARBARA E.: 1169sf, 2543zh, 2720u  
 THISELTON, A. C.: 3219l  
 THOMA, CLEMENS: 287*e*, 565*x*, 1166, 1525, 1573, 1771m, 1788, 1884, 1913, 2194, 2210*u*, 2299, 2299g, 2640e, 2825q  
 THOMSEN, PETER: 24  
 THOMSON, ROBERT W.: 3362a, 3544a  
 THORNHILL, R.: 784  
 THORNTON, T. C. G.: 697  
 THYEN, HARTWIG: 2093b, 2719  
 VAN TICHELEN, THEODOOR: 1053  
 TIEDE, DAVID L.: 705, 1764, 1800, 1996  
 TIMPE, DIETER: 1206h, 1460, 1469  
 TISHBY, ISAIAH: 3457*d*  
 TOAFF, ARIEL: 287, 292, 305, 309, 329, 341, 3447, 3454, 3456  
 TORREY, CHARLES C.: 852, 863, 1138k  
 TOURNAY, RAYMOND J.: 12a  
 TOV, EMANUEL: 776b  
 TOWNEND, G. B.: 1455, 1456, 1613  
 TRAILL, ROBERT: 113  
 TRENCÉNYI-WALDAFPEL, IMRE: 786  
 TREU, KURT: 3236b  
 TREVES, MARCO: 2009a  
 TRICOT, ALPHONSE E.: 769, 883, 2178, 2179, 2390  
 TRIEBER, KONRAD: 277, 296, 324  
 TRILLING, WOLFGANG: 2774m  
 TRIMBLE, VIRGINIA L.: 3150c  
 TROIANI, LUCIO: 156b, 744f, 968g, 2001aa, 2009aa  
 TSAFRIR, YORAM: 1009h, 1297g, 2957b, 2957i, 2986e, 3031g  
 TSCHERIKOWER, AVIGDOR: see TCHERIKOVER  
 TSCHIŻEWSKIJ, DIMTRIJ: 3440  
 TSOREF, EPHRAIM: 3068  
 TULAND, C. G.: 838  
 TURNER, ERIC G.: 1423  
 TURNER, H. E. W.: 1389c, 2873c  
 TURNER, NIGEL: 2851  
 TYLOCH, WITOLD: 2543k  
  
 UFFENHEIMER, BENJAMIN: 799  
 ULLENDORFF, EDWARD: 801, 802  
 ULRICH, EUGENE C.: 776, 776a  
 ULRICHSEN, J. H.: 2395g, 2543s  
 Union Theological Seminary Library: 9  
 United States Library of Congress: 7

- University of Chicago Oriental Institute: 8  
 VAN UNNIK, WILLEM C.: 1*b*, 438*f*, 488*c*, 581*f*,  
 596, 596*a*, 601*a*, 601*d*, 744*i*, 917, 1789*h*,  
 1803*k*, 1803*me*, 1825, 2100*d*, 2101, 3219*c*  
 URBACH, EPHRAIM E.: 413, 1138*i*, 1265*i*,  
 1444*d*, 1589, 1827*a*, 1967, 1984*j*, 2012*c*,  
 2102, 2216*c*, 2314*b*, 2357*h*  
 URMAN, DAN: 3165*a*  
 USENER, KARL H.: 195  
 USSANI, GIULANO: 187, 202  
 USSANI, VINCENTIUS (VINCENZO): 176, 177,  
 182, 3405  
 USSISHKIN, DAVID: 3031, 3031*n*  
 VAILLANT, ANDRÉ: 209, 212, 237, 259  
 VALENCY, MAURICE J.: 3395  
 VALETON, I. M. J.: 1584  
 VANDIER, JACQUES: 732  
 VAN'T HOF, PIETER: 1049  
 VARDAMAN, (E.) JERRY: 1404, 2982, 2986*b*  
 VARSAT, I.: 933*i*  
 VASSILIEV, A.: 3379*c*  
 DE VAUX, ROLAND: 870, 2419, 2521, 2533,  
 2534, 3167, 3169  
 VELLAS, VASILIOS (BASILIOS) M.: 166, 2377  
 VERMÈS, GÉZA: 30, 456, 565*t*, 615, 616, 662,  
 687, 703, 716, 723*a*, 915, 933*p*, 1096,  
 1101*b*, 1169*n*, 1418, 1457, 1499, 1523,  
 1537, 1586, 1637, 1651, 1660, 1668, 1762,  
 1803*p*, 1866*h*, 2107*f*, 2242*i*, 2357*l*, 2371,  
 2372, 2392*e*, 2400*a*, 2429*o*, 2466, 2467,  
 2543*t*, 2543*zp*, 2631*d*, 2690*j*, 2696, 2724,  
 2786, 2840  
 VIDAL-NAQUET, PIERRE: 133*a*, 565*p*, 3112*g*,  
 3119*c*, 3150*d*  
 VIDMAN, LADISLAV: 21  
 VIELHAUER, P.: 1984*h*  
 VILLALBA I VARNEDA, PERE: 581*c*, 581*j*  
 VINCENT, LOUIS-HUGUES: 1832, 1833, 2991,  
 3015, 3017, 3027  
 VINK, J. G.: 2154*a*, 2170*c*  
 VISCHER, LUKAS: 1084*c*  
 VISCHER, WILHELM: 3234  
 VITUCCI, GIOVANNI: 156*a*, 1635*b*  
 VIVIANO, BENEDICT THOMAS: 2009*d*  
 VAN VLIET, HENDRIK: 2054  
 VOGELSTEIN, MAX: 810  
 VOGT, ERNST: 817, 1857*g*, 3014*d*  
 VOKES, F. E.: 1803*q*  
 VOLKMANN, HANS: 1307*f*, 1414  
 VOLLMER, HANS: 3374  
 VOOGD, HENRY: 919*k*  
 WAAGENAAR, SAM: 371*c*, 1469*c*, 1494*b*  
 WACHOLDER, BEN ZION: 334, 447, 674, 684,  
 688, 708, 1059, 1665, 1703, 1707, 1715,  
 1857*n*, 1948*h*, 2068*b*  
 WACHSMUTH, CURT: 1669  
 WACKS, MEL: 1358*c*  
 WADDELL, WILLIAM G.: 727  
 WÄCHTER, LUDWIG: 1813, 1973, 2211  
 WAGNER, SISTER MONICA: 3526  
 WAGNER, SIEGFRIED: 49  
 WAKE, WILLIAM C.: 3538  
 WALBANK, FRANK W.: 3532  
 WALLACE, DAVID H.: 2409  
 WALLACE-HADRILL, DAVID S.: 2795  
 WALLACH, LUITPOLD: 348, 348*a*, 2108  
 WALSER, JOSEPH G.: 930  
 WALSH, JAMES P. M.: 1089, 1249  
 WALTER, NIKOLAUS: 1671*b*, 1689, 1704, 1705,  
 3195  
 WALTERS, PETER: see KATZ, PETER  
 WALTON, FRANCIS R.: 1970  
 WANSBROUGH, HENRY: 1373*a*, 1389*e*, 1547*a*  
 WARBURTON, WILLIAM: 1985  
 WASSERSTEIN, ABRAHAM: 128, 380, 422, 2242,  
 2271, 2314, 2321  
 WAXMAN, MEYER: 285, 355, 2234  
 WEBER, EKKEHARD: 1415  
 WEBER, HANS-RUEDI: 2640*p*  
 WEBER, MAX: 2261  
 WEBER, WILHELM: 430, 450, 1518, 1582,  
 1610, 1633, 2022, 3104, 3320  
 WEBSTER, GRAHAM: 1605*e*  
 WEGENAST, KLAUS: 2576, 2677  
 WEHRLI, FRITZ: 1673, 1703*f*  
 WEILER, INGOMAR: 1592, 3336  
 WEILL, GEORGES-J.: 91*b*  
 WEILL, JULIEN: 798, 1759  
 WEIMANN, ROBERT: 3397  
 WEINGARTEN, SAMUEL H.: 3125  
 WEINSHALL, JACOB: 3477  
 WEIS, PINKAS R.: 1180  
 WEISS, HANS-FRIEDRICH: 1799, 2242*b*,  
 2242*zb*  
 WEISS, RAPHAEL: 2125, 2125*c*  
 WEISS-ROSMARIN, TRUDE: 3098, 3099, 3100,  
 3101, 3102, 3113, 3114, 3119*b*, 3121, 3122,  
 3123, 3124, 3509*b*  
 WEISSENBERGER, KLAUS: 3475  
 WEITZMANN, KURT: 3318, 3438*a*, 3438*b*,  
 3438*c*  
 WELLES, CHARLES BRADFORD: 3217  
 WELLHAUSEN, JULIUS: 358, 2204

- WENGER, LEOPOLD: 565a, 1206b, 1866a, 1948a  
 WERBER, EUGEN: 2562  
 WESTCOTT, BROOKE F.: 646, 1210  
 WESTERHOLM, STEPHEN: 2242z  
 WEVERS, JOHN: 759  
 WEWERS, GERD A.: 933w, 2139o  
 WEYL, HEINRICH: 2035  
 WHISTON, WILLIAM: 103, 104, 105  
 WHITAKER, GEORGE H.: 1765  
 WHITE, JOHN L.: 949c, 1009k, 3259c  
 WHITELOCKE, LESTER T.: 933s, 2242q  
 WIBBING, SIEGFRIED: 2953  
 WIDENGREN, GEO: 919q, 1352d, 1353, 1512c  
 WIEFEL, WOLFGANG: 1169v  
 WIESENBERG, ERNEST: 375  
 WIKENHAUSER, ALFRED: 2827, 2888  
 WIKGREN, ALLEN: 67, 72, 118  
 WILDE, ROBERT: 1671a  
 WILHELM, ADOLF: 942, 1013  
 WILKEN, ROBERT L.: 1169u, 1492c  
 WILKINSON, JOHN: 1599a, 1599h, 1857i, 2210n, 3001m, 3014b  
 WILL, EDOUARD: 925  
 WILLETS, ROBERT H.: 1565  
 WILLI, THOMAS: 1984i  
 WILLIAMS, CHARLES S. C.: 2880, 2887  
 WILLIAMS, HENRY S.: 3393  
 WILLIAMS, SAM K.: 1009m, 1818g  
 WILLIAMSON, GEOFFREY A.: 125, 127, 481, 2762  
 WILLIAMSON, H. G. M.: 919r  
 WILLIS, JAMES A.: 190  
 WILLOUGHBY, HAROLD R.: 35  
 WILLRICH, HUGO, 1051h, 1067, 1068, 1213, 1685, 1922  
 WILMART, ANDRÉ: 3364  
 WILSON, EDMUND: 3073  
 WILSON, JOHN A.: 737  
 WILSON, WILLIAM R.: 2640g  
 WILSON, R. MC L.: 1084g  
 WINK, WALTER: 1563c, 2640f, 2720k  
 WINLOCK, HERBERT E.: 735  
 WINTER, PAUL: 1385, 1509, 1853, 1901, 1946, 2265b, 2723, 2724d, 2767, 2768, 2825, 2881, 2891c  
 WIRGIN, WOLF: 991, 1007, 1009c, 1009i, 1102c, 1309, 1310, 1431, 1444b, 3150, 3185  
 WISCHMEYER, ODA: 3203a  
 WISCHNITZER, RACHEL: 1856  
 WISEMAN, DONALD J.: 749, 811, 2061  
 WISEMAN, T. P.: 3214a  
 WITTIG, JOSEPH: 179  
 WITTY, FRANCIS J.: 206a  
 WOLF, EDWIN: 263, 290  
 WOLF, LUCIEN: 264  
 WOLFF, CHRISTIAN: 828d  
 WOLFSON, HARRY A.: 1938  
 WOOD, LYNN H.: 714  
 WOOLLEY, CHARLES L.: 816  
 WRIGHT, ADDISON G.: 620, 621, 622  
 WRIGHT, GEORGE ERNEST: 2139d, 2139e, 2145, 2165a, 2939, 3158c  
 WRIGHT, ROBERT B.: 2543h  
 YADIN, YIGAEI: 599, 1092m, 1100, 2329, 2449b, 2462a, 2543q, 3052, 3053, 3054, 3057, 3058, 3059, 3060, 3061  
 YANKELEVITCH, RAFAEL: 1373c  
 YARDEN, LEON: 1628a, 1628b  
 YAVETZ, ZVI: 1206j, 1620e  
 YEHOSHUA, AVRAHAM B.: 3511a  
 YEIVIN, SHEMUEL (SAMUEL): 1850, 2938  
 YELNITSKY, L. A.: 1409  
 YERUSHALMI, JOSEPH: 23a  
 YIZHAR, MICHAEL: 53  
 YOYOTTE, JEAN: 1075  
 ZADOKS (JOSEPHUS JITTA), ANNIE N. 3079  
 ZAFREN, HERBERT C.: 91, 3390  
 ZANDEE, JAN: 3361  
 ZAYADINE, F.: 2136  
 ZEITLIN, SOLOMON (SALOMON): 214, 222, 223, 233, 249, 250, 297, 298, 299, 325, 353, 371f, 377, 389, 398c, 410, 420, 425f, 579, 643d, 647, 808, 889, 916, 998, 1011, 1051j, 1094, 1122, 1123, 1124, 1169, 1181, 1238, 1359, 1434, 1548, 1553, 1635b, 1845, 1852, 1862, 1908, 1923, 1937, 1939, 1941, 2018, 2048p, 2057, 2074a, 2079, 2103, 2112, 2186, 2240, 2266, 2267, 2269, 2272, 2283, 2300, 2301, 2337, 2340, 2342, 2361, 2365, 2500, 2545, 2546, 2586, 2588, 2589, 2591, 2592, 2593, 2650, 2652, 2654, 2661, 2662, 2671, 2674, 2688, 2690a, 2697, 2715, 2737, 2807, 2808, 2824, 2867, 2907, 2918, 3080, 3081, 3082, 3136, 3141, 3150a, 3151, 3152, 3212, 3212a, 3219s, 3256, 3259, 3349, 3528, 3529  
 ZELLER, EDUARD: 2383  
 ZERON, ALEXANDER: 2170  
 ZIEGLER, KARL-HEINZ: 1348, 3335  
 ZIEGLER, KONRAT: 1727  
 ZIELIŃSKI, THADDÉE: 1478  
 ZIESLER, J. A.: 3219j

ZIMMELS, HIRSCH J.: 270, 282, 293, 351

ZIMMERMANN, FRANK: 338

ZINBERG, ISRAEL: 274, 321

ZISKIND, JONATHAN R.: 3388g

ZLOTNIK, JACOB: 367, 372, 2739

ZOLL, LEONARD S.: 290d, 291

ZUCKER, C. F.: 3176b

ZUCKER, HANS: 1893

ZUNTZ, GÜNTHER: 1696, 3200

ZUNZ, LEOPOLD: 317